DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 065 PS 001 504

By-Mayer, Anna B.
Day Care as a Social Instrument: A Policy Paper.
Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. School of Social Work.
Spons Agency-Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Jan 65
Note-182p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$9.20
Descriptors-*City Problems, Compensatory Education Programs, *Day Care Programs, Day Care Services, *Economically Disadvantaged, Federal Aid, Federal Legislation, *Poverty Programs, Preschool Education, *Program Proposals, Religious Agencies, State Aid, State Legislation, Welfare Agencies
Identifiers-New York City

This report is an analysis of the problems facing urban areas in relation to their preschool programs for the disadvantaged. The main focus is New York City day care centers. Subjects include day care and preschool education, history of the origin and expansion of day care centers, New York City's day care, and educational issues encompassing legislative proposals, sectarianism, and religious issues. Chapter VI relates to national problems and discusses various states' solutions. The following subjects are also discussed: the interpretations of day care's responsibility, the validity of its solutions, new agencies with related functions, new federal legislation, and new theories of education and child development. The report ends with a proposal for the beginners' day school. (DO)

ED0 27065

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS TED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION TION OR POLICY.

DAY CARE AS A SOCIAL INSTRUMENT: A POLICY PAPER

BY

ANNA B. MAYER

PS 001504

DAY CARE AS A SOCIAL INSTRUMENT:
A POLICY PAPER

by Anna B. Mayer

with the collaboration of Alfred J. Kahn

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
JANUARY, 1965

PS001504

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments iii

Preface iv

I. The Problem 1

II. Day Care and Pre-School Education 11

III. Day Care - Origin and Expansion 21

IV. New York City's Day Care - Today 43

V. Spotlight on the Issues 79

VI. The National Arena 97

VII. Current Attitudes 107

VIII. The Beginners' Day School: A Proposal 143

Footnotes

Appendix

- A Members of Joint Policy Committee of New York City Day Care Council and Department of Welfare
- B Family Status Statistics - 20% Sampling 1962-1963, Prepared by Division of Day Care
- C State Advisory Committee for Day Care
- D List of Individuals Interviewed, Affiliations, and Positions Held
- E Interest Groups Represented in Interviews
- F Cooperating Organizations, National Committee For the Day Care of Children, Inc.

This undertaking, carried out between January and June, 1964, had the encouragement and financial backing of the Ford Foundation. We are especially indebted to Mr. Henry Saltzman, the Program Associate of its Public Affairs Program, who facilitated the enterprise in every way possible.

We are grateful to many individuals who, in organizational or personal capacities, furnished data-- and in some cases unpublished studies - and who shared with us their views as to next directions in this developing field.

The report is now being made available to a larger audience in response to requests and to the urging of those concerned with sound planning in the field.

January, 1965

Preface

This paper provides dramatic evidence of the rapid sweep of events as urban areas seek to invent ways to cope with the needs and aspirations of disadvantaged citizens. When the work began, there was considerable unclarity as to whether, or how, special programs for the pre-school age group could be developed as part of a total strategy for dealing with educational and developmental deprivation. In New York City, at least, the search for a means of coping with these massive problems has led to considerable consensus in recent months as to the need for pre-school programs as part of the total design. What we offer here, therefore, is not a new idea. It is intended, rather, to provide a basis for some choices as to institutional location and character of the new efforts.

I

THE PROBLEM

During the past year the rediscovery of poverty has provided increasingly detailed and disconcerting documentation that rising prosperity and increased average incomes have left behind a group of 30 to 50 million Americans who live under conditions ranging from considerable want to dire poverty. Included in these totals are 17 to 23 million children. Thus, as many as one-fourth, or perhaps even one-third, of the country's future citizens are growing up in the grey shadows of serious deprivation.

These are the children whose parents, in large proportions are non-white and poorly educated; in low-paid unskilled occupations, partially employed or unemployed; in agriculture, in areas of the country suffering from declining economies or automation; in households where the mother is head of the family. What is more, the families tend to be large, and limited resources are shared with numbers of brothers and sisters.

The children of the poor often inherit[1] from their parents all of their deprivations and deficiencies, including low levels of expectation and aspiration and a general apathy toward education. Parents with very few educational and cultural goals for themselves, living on marginal incomes, are in no position to provide home settings conducive to learning or normal growth. These homes are usually lacking in space, books, toys and in the minimal quiet and privacy required to do school homework.

The children of our concern thus are concentrated in families whose characteristics predispose many of them to lives of waste and despair. Moreover they live in neighborhoods which can also be described as culturally deprived and disadvantaged and which do not offer stimuli to move beyond family limitations. In New York City, Mayor Robert F. Wagner has identified 16 such poverty-depressed communities. Crowded and dilapidated housing, segregation, inferior social institutions, instability and mobility characterize these areas.

Children, often the casualties of family and community neglect, apathy and rejection, are vulnerable to the familiar roster of social ills. Many become school dropouts, juvenile delinquents, narcotics addicts and, later, parents out of wedlock. Many also display multiple symptoms of personal and social disorganization or disadvantage.

Overall solutions to the poverty problem must be based on the country's vast productive capacities and organizing skills, and on social and economic policies assuring job opportunities and adequate income maintenance. Poverty pockets need to be eradicated through area redevelopment programs of the kind now under way in a number of places.

But in our present context, it is possible, and indeed urgent, to focus on the problems of children in launching a systematic effort to break the cycle of dependency, delinquency and disturbance. Broader community and institutional change, opening potential new life chances to deprived children, does not of itself assure that opportunities will be grasped and utilized.

Any educational system in its simplest terms is a formal arrangement of social relationships, personnel and equipment to meet the need to transfer knowledge, skills and values from one generation to the next. It is the chief means by which people extend their way of living and hope for improving it into the future; a breakdown or inadequacy in an educational system means breakdown or inadequacy of the community or society itself.[2]

Responsibility for the transfer of knowledge between generations is usually shared by family and community; the specific division of responsibility depends on the role of the family in a given period of industrial development as well as the adequacy or inadequacy of given families within particular communities.

Deprived families living in disadvantaged areas must rely to greater extent on community institutions to transmit skills and values, than middle-class families who are able to teach many of the essentials by example and household resources. The child's living experience in the local neighborhood must provide him with links and access to the broader roads leading towards participation in the world of employment.

Where home limitations are considerable, the educational institutions and the social institutions, as well, must play a broader role in development. For low-income children, education is a particularly crucial vehicle for upgraded employment and improved income.

Yet for schools to play this special role, new approaches are necessary to education as a social institution. For the truth is that the traditional schools in these areas are as ill-equipped to meet the demands upon them as are the children to accept and utilize the schools' resources. Deprived children are often uninterested in and resistant to formal educational routines. They have been found unprepared for study and learning. The schools, in turn, generally have not been prepared to cope with lack of interest or resistance. The confrontation of resistance and the inability to overcome it has resulted in a large incidence of school failure, dropping out and general alienation.

Welfare and the Care of Children

While beyond our present scope, it must be noted that if the dependency cycle affecting children is to be broken, our welfare programs also need to be reexamined. Basic welfare programs, affecting almost one million families with over three million children, provide incomes too low to provide decent food and shelter, let alone school, medical and other necessary expenses; and in many states even this amount of aid is denied.[3]

Since fewer than a quarter of all poor families receive public assistance and less than one-half of all poor families receive *any* form of transfer payments to increase their resources,[4] it has become absolutely necessary for the woman to seek employment outside of the home. This occurs in low-income families with a female head only, as well as in husband-wife families. Although homemakers who go into homes of others are paid an appropriate wage, the Aid to Families with Dependent Children, hereafter referred to as AFDC, and other income maintenance benefit structures are so inadequate that no economic advantage or positive social status accrues to a mother who wants to remain at home and *be* a good homemaker.

While many social forces are at work, the inability of many men to earn enough without the second income of their wives partially accounts for the fact that there have been sharp and constant increases in the number of women with young children who work. In 1959, of 17.2 million married women in the labor force, approximately three million were women with children under six years of age.[5] The Health Department states that in New York City alone there are 88,000 working women with children under six. These numbers may in fact increase if the objectives of the 1962 Public Welfare amendments,[7] which stress rehabilitation and retraining services to enable women on AFDC to hold jobs, are implemented. The new federal child welfare day care program[8] is partially designed to advance this objective by providing for child

PS001504

care while mothers are being retrained. Thus far, retraining programs have had little to offer women with limited formal education and without means to provide supervision for their children.

It is not now economically feasible for low-income women who wish to do so to remain at home and care for their families, and it will not be, unless new approaches are found.

Whether supported through earned income or public assistance, the economically marginal family obviously requires bolstering and support as an environment for child rearing. The data relating to child care arrangements provide considerable cause for concern. Statistics released in a Children's Bureau report based on 1958 census data show:

> Over 400,000 young children were cared for away from their own homes, in homes of persons not related to them.
>
> Another 228,000 were cared for through informal arrangements which were difficult to classify.
>
> Only about one out of every 40, a total of 121,000 children, were in group care (day care centers, nursery schools).[9]

This indicates that in New York City a minimum of 22,000 children in families with mothers at work are cared for away from their own homes by persons not related to them.[10]

The Children's Bureau found the following additional facts in 1962:

> Children living with their mother only are twice as likely to have an employed mother as are children living in husband-wife families.
>
> Forty-four percent of these children living with mothers only have mothers whose income is less

> than $2,000 a year and 39% additional ones have mothers whose income is between $2,000 and $4,000 a year. In other words, 83% of all children with employed mothers, where the mother is the sole parent have incomes under $4,000 a year.[11]

It is widely held that availability of day care services would do much to strengthen these families as child rearing environments.

Yet, while the need for day care has risen sharply, the number of facilities has shown little change since World War II. Four years ago, the aggregate capacity of all reported licensed day care facilities in the United States including day care centers as well as family day care homes was an estimated 185,000 children.[12] States have been asked recently to report current figures to the Children's Bureau, but such data are not yet available.

It is not known exactly how many families use day care services and how many need them. However, the national and local statistics available on the numbers of unsupervised children under 12 years of age, the numbers of women in the working force, the numbers of broken homes, the inadequacy of public assistance grants, surely point toward a substantially greater need than there are facilities to meet it. In New York City conclusions may also be drawn from the available data for depressed urban districts with their high concentration of low-income families, broken homes, welfare recipients, and non-whites.

Size vs. Need

The New York City day care program presently serves only about 5,500 children in 85 kindergartens and pre-kindergarten centers,compared to over 11,000 children cared for in about 500 voluntary, commercial and/or sectarian programs.[13] Further, in the public program there is a waiting list of approved eligible children totaling over 4,000 or 80% of present enrollment. A small percent are school-age children.

Mayor Wagner's 16 enclaves of poverty contain 30 percent of the city's population, or close to two and one-half million persons.[14] In one of these, central Harlem, there are close to 30,000 children under ten.[15] On the basis of careful research, a HARYOU* spokesman has reported that pre-school groups are needed for at least 8,000 children under six. HARYOU proposes "pre-school academies" for about half of these (42 centers, each serving 100 children).**

Not all young children require this special service. But if we agree with HARYOU that there is an urgent need in central Harlem for facilities for about 4,000 children, compared to the present public program providing for only

---

*HARYOU, whose full name in "Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited" was set up initially with the aid of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime and has been financed both by federal as well as city funds, for the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan for the youth of central Harlem in the context of the poverty program.

** This proposal is contained in HARYOU's report. Youth in the Ghetto: A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness. 1964.

500, we have a ratio of eight to one of need in relation to present facilities.

If this ratio holds for the 16 poverty enclaves identified by the city, instead of the 5,500 children presently in the programs, we would require as a minimum, facilities for 40,000 children. Even if the Harlem ratio is extreme, there is obvious need for considerable expansion. Thus, on the basis of size alone, the present program including both public and private centers is woefully inadequate.

In addition, current welfare day care programs serve mainly children of working mothers. Yet there are many children who have serious needs for day care because of illness of the mother, emotional disturbance, desertion, crowded slum conditions, poor family relationship and family size. In New York City, welfare day care planners consider such children as eligible and needing child welfare day care service, but few of them can be found in New York public day care because space limitations tend to encourage a system which gives priority to the child whose mother is absent from the home.

Because day care has been regarded as an ancillary solution to family problems involving the assumption of substantial child-rearing responsibilities, planners have always recognized that socializing and educational activities must be an integral part of the group care of these young children. Today these aspects take on added significance in the search for compensatory educational programs for underprivileged children.

The present paper, a reexamination of the potential of day care as a medium for strengthening the developmental experiences of deprived children during their critical young years of three to five, gains impetus from the search for primary intervention devices to break the cycle of multiple disadvantage associated with poverty.

New York City has these problems in large measure; they are becoming more visible day by day; the day care program here is unique in its structure, policies, sponsorship and knowledgeable leadership. It is therefore an appropriate subject for a case study focused on the development of policy guides.

II

DAY CARE AND PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

Child Welfare and Day Care

What is day care's potential? It is necessary to begin by defining day care from the points of view of the various interests involved in this service. There are, in fact, two important mainstreams of thought in the daytime care of children below the age of six. Either or both of these may well be considered adaptable to a program of primary intervention.

The first is "day care," a term pre-empted by the welfare field, with special meaning growing out of its use and application. The second is "nursery school" or "nursery education," pre-empted by education. Both involve the care of children during the daytime hours out of their own homes for varying lengths of time. In the former, care and protection as extension of child rearing are viewed as the major attributes, with education a necessary adjunct. In the latter, education is viewed as primary, with care and protection indispensable, but supplementary.

Objectively, no program with any claim to professional standards can provide "care and protection" without satisfying the eager curiosity of a child to learn, nor can a program provide education without satisfying the child's need for care, affection, protection against hazards, food (if in school at lunch time), recreational activities, rest and so on. Both of these functions are inextricably woven in the dynamism of child growth and development.

This may seem to be a case of Tweedledum versus Tweedledee. But in the framework of our national institutions, there is sharp cleavage, both in practice and in law. The United States Children's Bureau staff views the present California child care program for low-income working mothers as not being within the purview of day care because it is educationally sponsored. The consequences of this position for the planning of services may be far-reaching. Educators, in turn, generally relegate day care to welfare authorities and do not develop programs for three or four-year olds.

For research purposes the Child Welfare League of America adopted a broad definition of day care to include:

> "All daytime care of children, living in their own homes, by persons other than their mothers. This includes in-home and out-of-home care: care by relatives or friends; compensated and uncompensated care. ..."16

Excluding private non-licensed arrangements a total "supplementary care" list includes:

Family day care: private homes selected by a social agency to provide a daytime mother for one or a few children, usually under three years of age.

Day care centers or day nurseries: group facilities attended all or most of the day, usually providing care and supervision in addition to social and educational experiences.

Nursery schools and kindergartens: group facilities for children three to six attending for short periods of the day, and where the educational experience is the major goal.

After-school recreation programs: programs of recreation and instruction for school-age children normally offered in schools, settlement houses and community centers.

Some of the confusion in regard to definition stems from the fact that day care services are sometimes defined in terms of the nature of the service being given, and sometimes in terms of the needs or symptoms of the users of the service. Also, there may not be any relationship between the name of a program, the way in which it is described and the services actually offered. For example, many agencies which are called day care centers offer too short a period of care to meet the needs of working mothers.

Within the overall day care grouping and its many inconsistencies of title and usage, a relatively clear definition emerges for child welfare day care. It is the potential of this type of program applied to the three-to-five-year-old with which this paper deals. As a social service, and a part of overall child welfare services, it is best described by the Child Welfare League and in the federal day care legislation of 1962.

The League delineates day care as one of a group of services to families which are designed to help children of all ages remain in their homes, as distinguished from services like foster care, where the child is placed out either in an institution or foster family home. The value of his own family to the child is stressed, and the program is seen as a way to keep families together and avoid full-time placement of children by assisting families who are unable alone to meet the total needs of their children. Thus, day care is seen as an extension of family responsibility and is tied to care and protection and the prevention of neglect.

In speaking for the Children's Bureau, a day care specialist comments that while certain nursery school and kindergarten programs appear indistinguishable from day care:

> "The child who needs day care in the sense we mean it has a very special family problem, which makes it impossible for his parents to completely fulfill the responsibility of parental supervision without day care." 17

Joseph Reid, Executive Director of the Child Welfare League of America recognizes:

> "So many components make up the day care picture ... education, health, mental health, counseling, finances, etc. that there is no short, straight line ... placing it unequivocably under one umbrella." 18

All child welfare spokesman note that the essential components of day care include health, education and social welfare, and that these may be needed in varying degrees by children in all forms of daytime care: in nursery schools, kindergartens and even recreation. However, they find in child welfare day care an element of difference present in the family of the child, personal problems among the children and home situations which require additional services. Also, they stress the provision of compensatory attention during the long day of care for the lack of home and parental contact.

A clearer focus emerges when we examine further the points made by child welfare personnel in distinguishing between day care and nursery schools.

> "The confusion of day care with education is in part due to the fact that the facilities of a nursery school, kindergarten, or public school may at times be used for children actually requiring a day care service; and that some nursery schools have extended their hours beyond those considered desirable in a nursery education program to allow for day care of children who need it. Some day care centers are called nursery schools, or may serve some children who need only the enriching experiences of an education program. ... Group day care, to meet the developmental needs of the child from three to six should have as an integral part an education program that is the same as that of a nursery school or kindergarten."[19]

In the final analysis, child welfare day care is differentiated from the nursery school or kindergarten and from extended school services in the following ways:

- Day care's primary purpose is care and protection; other programs are concerned primarily with education.
- There is a tendency in day care toward more sharing with parents of child rearing responsibilities.
- In day care some kind of needs test exists (economic or social, or both), since only children for whom this is the best form of help are to be admitted.

Defining Pre-School Education and Day Care

Since the early part of the century, there has been interest in the role "which impressions and experiences from early childhood exert in the development of men."[20] Systematic work has been done by psychologists, educators, pediatricians, sociologists and social workers. Such people as Arnold Gesell, Margaret Mead, Jean Piaget, Kurt Lewin, Anna Freud and David Levy have conducted investigations of pre-school personality and child development which have influenced thinking about the young child.

The educational components of this concern were reflected in the proceedings of the 1940 White House Conference on Children in a Democracy, which recommended that schools provide nursery school, kindergarten or similar educational opportunities for children between the ages of three to six. Again, the 1950 Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth recommended:

> "Nursery schools and kindergartens as a desirable supplement to home life, be included as part of public educational opportunity for children provided they meet high professional standards."[21]

In recent years, the interrelated disciplines of anthropology, psychology, sociology, economics and other social sciences have reexamined the problem of early education of the young on both theoretical and practical levels. From research and from day-to-day experience of professional educators and social workers, a picture of what is meant by education at the pre-school level is beginning to emerge. Despite a wide variety of approaches to the problem and vast difference in terminology employed, a significant unanimity of knowledge and opinion is found in the work of investigators into the physical, emotional, psychological and educational needs of children of pre-school age.

Anthropology speaks of education in terms of *culture:* the complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society still holds. Kroeber defined the formal segment of culture as education, whether in the schools, the church or in the home.[22]

Sociology sees education from the viewpoint of society and the structuring of its institutions to make possible the process of learning.

Psychology deals with the personality, motivation and behavior of the individual. Focusing on the individual, Hunt examines the process of cognitive development with respect to intelligence and education:

> "For over half a century, the leading theory of man's nature has been dominated by the assumption of fixed intelligence and predetermined development. ... in this traditional conception of intelligence and its relationship to experience. Evidence from various sources has been forcing a recognition of central processes in intelligence and of the *crucial role of life experience* in the development of these central processes."

Even motor development in the young child, in the view of this investigator, does not consist of the automatic unfolding of a behavioral sequence based on maturation of structures, but on opportunities for variations in patterns of stimulation and of experience, Hunt's concept suggests the way in which the social environment affects the child's socialization, maturation and cognitive development. His view is concurred in by a number of experts such as Martin Deutsch, Elizabeth Herzog, Miriam L. Goldberg, Kenneth Clark and others who are investigating the problems of the education of the pre-school child. All note that the child's socialization depends upon and must be accompanied by the satisfaction of his needs and wants.

If an educational system is a formal arrangement for transmitting to the young the dominant values and attitudes of a given community or culture as well as the social skills and aspirations which are the point of departure for full-time participation and personal upward mobility, then the question arises what are they and how can they be transmitted?

Unfortunately, in our depressed urban areas, alcoholism, drug addiction, disease, unemployment, anti-social behavior and despair all add up to a feeling that one cannot be part of the more successful community. Many terms are used to describe the children of these neighborhoods: "socially deprived," "culturally deprived," "under-privileged," "disadvantaged," "lower class," "lower socio-economic group" and so on. They generally mean the same thing: children whose home life is makeshift and empty, who survive rather than grow. Their backgrounds offer these children such an inadequate variety of experimental stimuli that they enter school with serious handicaps. They exhibit little motivation for the traditional types of formal education, and are recorded as showing gross underachievement in comparison with the more advantaged. They certainly lack skills for utilizing what society offers.

Thus, social deprivation and poverty are highly correlated with academic retardation. In 1959, 53% of students in academic high schools and 61% of the students in vocational high schools of central Harlem were dropouts.[24] In these schools tests in reading comprehension, word knowledge, arithmetic and intelligence all show much lower scores for the grade-school pupils of central Harlem than for those in New York City and the nation.[25] Deficiencies are found in their verbal and manipulative skills, and in the development of visual and auditory discrimination, attention span, memory, time orientation and language.[26]

Learning in the earlier grades is based on what children bring to the situation, and thus the deficits of the disadvantaged tend to increase as they go through school. In the later grades, the differences in favor of the more socially privileged groups become much greater, since, in general, school systems have failed to make it possible for children to overcome their pre-school handicaps.

Many of the children of today can be expected to be job-hunting fifteen years from now, and there is little doubt that jobs then will require even more schooling than jobs held by their parents today. Unskilled and semi-skilled work tend to decrease rapidly with automation and mechanization. Thus many educators agree that a "massive and effective program of compensatory education"[27] is urgently needed.

One approach is to start education earlier, possibly at three or four years of age, to provide programs designed to bridge the discrepancies between the home and the school. It is increasingly held that for many aspects of learning and development this time period may be optimal and critical.[28] Such education would provide for the intellectual, emotional and developmental needs of the total child. And it would have to be more than formal instruction to compensate for the multiple deprivations associated with disadvantaged status.

The essential requirements for education and socialization of pre-school children whose families cannot provide the necessary and basic care, food, training and education, have been demonstrated time and again:

> "The continuation and extension of the love, affection and firm guidance of their families; gradual adjustment and initiation into the surrounding world, as the child is led out from his small home center to his community and his nation; preparation for the demands and discipline of formal and substantive schooling; social adjustment and enjoyment of group activity with other children; manual dexterity and physical development; development of imagination and the senses through touch, taste, smell, sight, and sound; protection of a child's general health and well-being, through the provision of medical care and food which might not otherwise be available through his family or through other community services."[29]

Within this frame of reference does the New York City public day care program meet this need? If it does not, can it meet such a need? This is the central issue examined herein.

III

DAY CARE - ORIGIN AND EXPANSION

Early History[30]

Day care has many facets and generates a variety of concepts. It involves complex issues and arouses sharp conflicts, ambivalence and confusion among both lay and professional leaders. Since the conflicts and issues are rooted in its history, a review of the evolution of day care is presented as a basis for understanding the trends and forces which have culminated in the current positions and definitions - and as a backdrop for assessing its capacity to play a new role in solving current social problems.

New York City was the birthplace of day care in the United States. The Nursery for Children of the Poor was established in 1854, followed by the Virginia Nursery in 1872, and the Bethany Day Nursery in 1887. These early services, called day nurseries, were offered as philanthropic assistance: first, to children of Civil War widows; then, in the latter part of the 19th century, to children left alone during the day while their immigrant mothers worked in domestic service or in factories.Conceived as charity by wealthy women, these services sought to assist poor families by providing supplemental daytime child care, mainly custodial, focusing on physical needs and protection from environmental hazards.

Such day nurseries spread and improved, with the better ones utilizing what was known of medicine, nutrition, hygiene, and later, child development, in order to provide a service to meet the needs of the day. Paralleling their growth was the rise of the kindergarten movement, deriving its formulae from Froebel's work in Germany and resting on pedagogical considerations.

In 1896, the National Federation of Day Nurseries was organized "to secure the highest obtainable standards of merit."

> "The expansion of the work from the primary idea of feeding and housing babies to its present scope, which includes kindergarten, educational work for mothers, industrial classes for older children, summer outings and family visiting, touches the interest of both philanthropic and educational organizations."31

In the years that followed, research and experiment were directed toward educational guidance of underprivileged children in schools like Merrill-Palmer in Detroit and Bank Street College in New York. Emphasis was placed on deeper understanding of child care and development in the important work done at centers at Teachers College, Columbia University and a number of state universities. Day nurseries became sources for experimentation and teacher training; and in 1922 the Ruggles Street Nursery in Boston became the first nursery training school, marking the entrance of professionals into the field. As a result, programs in many day nurseries by the early 1900's began to incorporate constructive educational and developmental experiences for young children. Teachers, not nursery maids, began to be hired. It was not until well after World War I that the effect of these developments began to be felt in the day nurseries of New York City. However, it was still not widespread.

About the turn of the century, day nurseries generally began to be concerned with health standards. In New York, day care centers had been covered by the provisions of the Municipal Sanitary Code from 1895. In 1905, physicians began to inspect the facilities of nursery programs, and the Bureau of Child Hygiene under the New York City Department of Health required that a licensed physician give a medical examination to every child cared for in a nursery. In fact, however, little was done to inspect nurseries regularly or to close those which fell below standard.

By the time of the depression of the 1930's, there had begun to emerge in some of the better day care programs an integration of the disciplines of health, education and welfare. Social work concepts were introduced in the second and third decades of this century. Casework and the value of day nurseries as a strengthening force in family life were stressed in the day nurseries sponsored by social agencies. Some persons in social work had begun to see day care as part of the total network of child caring agencies and as requiring casework support. For example, Sophie Van Theis found:

> "All child caring agencies, irrespective of the particular type of service which they give ... have

> come ... to think of casework as an essential part of a good child care program ... by tradition, by character, by history, the day nursery is a social agency. ... I do not see that this in any way prevents it from becoming as well an excellent educational institution and a health agency. ... we have come to think of education, health, and welfare as closely related interests which cannot be separated... in our program for children."32

The WPA Program

The daytime care of children received major impetus from Civil War, World War I, the Depression and World War II -- all periods when mothers left home to work. Yet in spite of positive response to the early day nurseries, expansion of programs has been sporadic. It was during the depression of the 1930's with the establishment of nursery schools financed by the federal government, under FERA and later WPA, that day care had its largest growth.

The prime goal of federal action in 1933 was to give employment to needy teachers, nurses, nutritionists, clerical workers, cooks, janitors and others as part of work relief programs designed to counter unemployment.

The program, however, "enlisted the leadership and guidance of outstanding persons in the field. Intensive in-service and pre-service training program for staff, parent education and community interpretation did much to promote standards and to focus attention on the value of nursery education .... The WPA nursery school, althought set up by government to meet a welfare need, was identified primarily as an educational service and was usually located in school buildings."[33]

Federal funds were made available to state departments of education, and local boards operated the nurseries. Approximately 1900 nursery schools were set up. By 1937 they were providing 40,000 children with what most professionals today still consider to have been a high standard of health and nutritional care, as well as nursery education. These nurseries served a dual purpose: providing employment, and relieving some of the conditions of the depression which affected children adversely.

Philosophically, the program represented "the first recognition by the federal and state government that the education and guidance of children from 2 to 5 years of age is a responsibility warranting the expenditure of public funds."[34]

Public day care in New York City began with the WPA nursery program. By 1938, there were fourteen nursery schools operated by the local Board of Education. One of these was housed in a public school building, while the others were in settlement houses or in other available free space. It is noted by Fleiss that in New York City the school board was not as active in WPA nursery school administration as were local educational authorities in other cities.

As the Forties approached and WPA was no longer a necessary source of employment, it seemed likely that the day care program would end. Improved economic conditions made it more and more difficult to obtain unemployed teachers. Yet, by 1942, there were still thirty-two operating WPA nurseries in New York which faced liquidation early in 1943. Public clamor began for continued public subsidy for day care and for expansion to meet the needs of mothers engaged in and seeking work in the war effort.

The Lanham Act

Throughout the country industry burgeoned, and when the draft of men into the armed services started, women were called into the factories, and families by the thousands crowded into the war production areas. Children were being left alone, locked in parked cars, or forced to join the increasing number of "latch key" children, shifting for themselves.

All of this led to the Congressional passage of the Community Facilities Act of 1941, commonly known as the Lanham Act, under which federal funds were available to the states on a fifty-fifty matching basis for the establishment and expansion of day care centers and nursery schools in defense areas. These funds could also be used to convert WPA facilities to wartime projects.

The United States Office of Education was given responsibility for the development and extension of nursery schools to be operated in or under the auspices of local schools and for related school lunch and recreation programs.The United States Children's Bureau received a similar assignment with respect to day care centers and related services sponsored by agencies not a part of the school program. After July 1942, additional funds were made available to state departments of education and public welfare for the promotion and coordination of day care programs under their supervision.[35]

The attitude of the Children's Bureau in this general field was that mothers of pre-school children should not be encouraged to work; but if they did indeed work, the community had an obligation to provide services to help parents care for their children, with state and local governments assuming the responsibility for supervising and maintaining adequate standards. Thus, the approach of the Children's Bureau towards the Lanham Act day care program was at best ambivalent. Some within the Bureau looked with misgiving on what they feared would be interpreted as a public sanction of the employment of women. They were joined by some social work leaders who were concerned that the federal stimulus to day care would in the long run be destructive of the family and contrary to basic American values. However, as it became clear that the emergency situation had first priority, the Bureau undertook the stimulation of counseling services in support of day care and developed a comprehensive set of standards for the guidance of communities.

Widespread acceptance of this wartime program is indicated by the fact that by July 1945, about 1,600,000 children were receiving care in nurseries and day care centers financed largely by federal funds.

After Lanham: California

When the Lanham Act funds were withdrawn nationally, there was still a large demand for women workers in California, in the aircraft and electronics industries. The largest surviving program which owes its inception to the Lanham Act is thus the program of the state of California. Its Legislature in 1946 authorized the temporary establishment of a statewide program under the State Department of Education and local school districts. Technically it is still temporary. While the state controls the child care program, it is established and administered by the local school districts, but is not part of the public education system. At last report, eighty-four child care centers exist in Los Angeles alone, under the supervision of the assistant superintendent of schools. The state pays 60% of the cost, the parents 30% and the remaining 10% is met by local school district taxes. Eighty percent of the mothers now enrolling their children in the California program are the sole support of their families (as compared to less than 50% in New York) in a program serving about 25,000 nursery as well as school-age children annually in 234 centers in 47 school districts.

Authority to establish educational standards rests with the California State Department of Education, which has as its primary concern the total educational needs of children in order to guarantee to them "the best opportunity to grow into healthy, well-adjusted adults, able to assume their responsibilities as citizens."[36]

A major goal is to provide compensatory experiences for children from culturally disadvantaged backgrounds in preparation for later formal education.

In addition, California has a second network of nursery school and day care programs operated under local philanthropic auspices and private ownership. These programs have shown a marked increase in recent years, while the public program has not continued to reflect the increased need and actually shows a decrease in the number of centers over the years. This is attributed in part to loss of space for housing day care.[37]

Chicago

Chicago had 23 centers operating at the time of the Second World War, but today there are no programs of public day care in the state of Illinois.

Philadelphia

In Philadelphia there were 20 public day care programs for children of working mothers during the war, which from 1944 were operated by the Board of Education. These centers during the war were supported through a combination of Lanham Act funds, city funds and parents' fees. The city of Philadelphia and fees have continued to support the centers since 1946. In 1960, 11 of the child care centers were housed in elementary schools and two in housing projects.

Detroit

While there are presently no publicly supported day care centers in Detroit, during World War II there were 80 such centers, administered by the Detroit Board of Education and supported by Lanham Act Funds. Here again, when federal funds were discontinued, the Detroit Department of Public Welfare took over the administration of the 19 day care centers that remained. By 1957, however, there were only three left, for the Department of Welfare was never convinced that day care was a welfare responsibility. The centers had been housed in public school buildings, and the expanding school-age population created a pressure for additional classroom space.

Thus ,with a few exceptions, there has been severe attrition in day care in most of the country since withdrawal of federal funds. There remain only the California cities with their state-supported educational day care; Philadelphia, where city appropriations support a small educational day care program; and New York City with the largest welfare day care program.

New York City

In cities denoted by the federal government as war-impacted areas, WPA nurseries were converted to serve working mothers. Upon the disbanding of the WPA program, New York City had a special problem, however. The Lanham Act did not apply here since the city was not designated as a war-impacted area, and thus it faced the prospect of the loss of its major financial resource with respect to day care.

Public campaigns were started to bring pressure for New York City to provide public subsidy and to expand the existing program in order to meet the increasing needs caused by the impending war. Parent groups became particularly active in this movement. Additional backing also came from women's social action groups with a mass character, primarily the Committee for the Wartime Care of Children, headed by Elinor Gimbel, working outside of the professional and institutional framework of the day care program. The latter group attracted considerable support from several quarters: parents who needed the service to work; women who espoused the cause of publicly supported day care for working women as a patriotic one; and women who were concerned mainly with the effects on children of women already in the labor force.

Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia appointed the Commissioners of Health and Welfare and the Superintendent of Schools to study the needs for day care in the light of the new wartime emergency. This group recommended expansion of existing facilities and training programs, as well as counseling service for mothers seeking employment. They called for stricter enforcement of existing laws governing nurseries. The establishment of a permanent committee composed of civic and governmental leaders to coordinate and administer the expanded program was proposed.

On October 25, 1942, Mayor LaGuardia, adopting this idea, appointed a committee of 14, called the Mayor's Committee on Wartime Care of Children, hereafter referred to as the Mayor's Committee. This committee included members of religious, labor, social welfare and governmental agencies and offered the potential for a broad concept of day care.

State Financing

In 1942, the New York State Legislature approved the Moffet Act,* providing for direct state aid to municipalities and to supplement Lanham funds for the establishment of day care centers under the direction of the State War Council. The Mayor's Committee was designated as the New York City representative. Where federal funds did not apply, as in New York City, the State War Council set up the requirements whereby the state would contribute one-third, the city one-third, and one-third of the cost would come from parents' fees or community contribution. Upstate communities were getting about one-half of their support from federal Lanham funds with state funds supplementing up to an additional 15%. On March 4, 1943, Mayor LaGuardia wrote to Governor Dewey advising him that the city would need $360,000, to serve 1,000 children in 28 WPA nursery schools in New York City, and would adopt the tripartite financing plan with each segment contributing $120,000.

The Mayor's Committee on April 5, 1943 gave WPA schools until July 1, 1943 to revise their admission policy in order to qualify for state aid. Seventeen of the former WPA nurseries did this and were absorbed into the Mayor's Committee program, as well as many other nurseries operated by settlements, churches, day nurseries and separate boards. Thus, by mid-1943, there were 33 nurseries and 13 school-age centers with a capacity of 1,654 children ages two to five and 750 children ages six to fourteen operated under the Mayor's Committee at a cost of $315,000.

---

*New York State Emergency Act, ch 445, Laws of New York, 1942.

The Mayor's Committee saw difficulties in having the Board of Education guarantee two-thirds of the centers' operating costs and collect fees. It was therefore decided to have them operated by the Department of Welfare with Board of Education staff. The minutes of the Mayor's Committee for April 5, 1943 state:

> "With educational standards so protected, the program ... becomes an educational program administered by the Department of Welfare." [38]

However, this arrangement never became a reality. On April 16, 1943, the Mayor announced:

> "The city will not operate any nurseries through any city department, but payment will be made to nurseries on the same basis that they are now made to institutions for dependent children. The policy ... will be to place children in private nurseries operated by existing child welfare or other social agencies with the city and state contributing one-third each of the cost." [39]

Under this arrangement, the voluntary operating agencies would be responsible for raising additional funds if parents' fees failed to reach the required one-third share. Funds were to be handled through the budget of the Department of Welfare, thus making this agency the administrative authority. Objection to this decision were raised by the United Parents Association and the Public Education Association, both of which preferred to have the day nurseries run by the Board of Education.

While the contribution of the Board of Education during the Depression consisted mainly of supplying unemployed teachers as staff members, the educators on the Mayor's Committee felt that the quality of the educational program would be more closely protected and this part of the program improved if operated under educational auspices. However, under the Moffet Act, the Department of Welfare was not only authorized to collect fees, but it could administer city and state funds which might become available through the Lanham Act.

Mayor LaGuardia's own decision was undoubtedly strongly influenced by his often stated opposition to the idea of having women leave their small children to go to work. Fleiss comments:

> "He was reluctant to make the state the 'father and mother of the child'."[40]

In order to limit such assistance to those who really required it, he felt that appropriate study of each case was necessary, and that the Welfare Department, with its investigatory procedures, could properly carry out this policy. The staff of the Information and Counseling Services were cautioned to review with the mothers the advantages and disadvantages of going to work.[41]

The minutes do not show the actual reasons for LaGuardia's decision to use voluntary sponsoring agencies, but Fleiss conjectures that Mayor LaGuardia was trying to obtain state funds without involving the city too directly in the actual operation. One might also speculate that the proposal for public operation was seen as too direct a challenge to New York City's purchase-of-care child welfare pattern as it then existed.

Opponents to LaGuardia's plan for voluntary sponsoring agencies pointed to the fact that these arrangements, creating a need to deal with so many different volunteer boards, would limit the expansion of day care service. They claimed that such a pattern would complicate the development of standards and require a complex structure of supervision to protect expenditures. However, LaGuardia's decisions prevailed.

In the first seven months of 1943, eight Offices of Information and Counseling, manned by personnel of the Department of Welfare were opened. Counselors helped to determine need for day care services, evaluated existing facilities, and through personal interviews with mothers, attempted to assess individual family needs for day care. In accordance with LaGuardia's philosophy, the staff of these offices often counseled mothers to stay at home rather than work.

In 1944, the state continued its appropriation and made provision for rent and cost of equipment. By December 31, 1945, there were then 68 centers with a total capacity of approximately 4,000 children. A large part of the professional and clerical staff of the Mayor's Committee (31 of 44 workers) were on loan from the Department of Welfare.

Board of Education Attitudes

The alternative to the welfare auspices at the time necessarily would have been the Board of Education, which had never become involved in the day care program to the degree that such boards were in other communities. For example, experimentation with kindergartens for four-year olds was discontinued in 1952 on the basis that the primary responsibility was to five-year olds and that four-year olds could not be accomodated in the same program. This view was typical of the general approach.

Voluntary Support

In addition, then, to the early and continued use of the Department of Welfare as the wartime administering and financing agency for day care, and the lack of real involvement or assumption of responsibility on the part of the Board of Education, a third factor influenced the creation of the unique pattern of public day care which exists in New York City today. There was a deep involvement of private groups and individuals in both the operation and financing of the centers. Many voluntary organizations provided funds to supplement those from the tri-partite pattern of wartime contributions by state,city and parent fees. In 1942, the Marshall Field Foundation and the New York Foundation helped to pay the salary of the executive director of the Mayor's Committee. In 1944, the New York National War Fund gave grants for salaries and to supply equipment for the new centers, and in 1946 granted another $58,000 to the Mayor's Committee.

Educational organizations supplied consultants and directors. Research organizations and schools served as a field staff to make surveys as to where the need for day care was the greatest. Even related governmental services were contributed. The Civilian Defense Volunteer Office assisted by training nursery school assistants. The War Food Administration provided funds under its school lunch program.

As a way of expanding day care centers in the city, the Mayor's Committee had encouraged the formation of citizens' groups in neighborhoods where there was need for new facilities. The Mayor's Committee estimated that by 1945, nearly 1,000 persons had shared responsibility with the state and city governments for operating and financing the day care program. The intense participation in planning of so many professionals and volunteers of high caliber from the fields of education, health and welfare gave the program the character of permanency rather than emergency.

The Horan Report[42]

As the war drew to a close in 1945, however, the temporary nature of the state's support became evident. The War Council was disbanded in 1946, and the responsibility for day care was transferred temporarily to the Youth Commission by Governor Thomas E.Dewey, who ordered an evaluation of the program.

This study, known as the Horan Report, became the ultimate basis upon which Dewey ended the program. In brief, it concluded that:

1. The primary emergency need for which the program was established no longer existed.
2. In New York City, where the majority of the funds were used, the needs test was elastic and generally unverified.

3. It would be necessary to establish the priority of this program in relation to other social welfare needs, to be financed by the state - such as housing, increases in teachers' salaries and other demands.
4. There was no proof that the program justified the expenditure.
5. If the program were to be assimilated into the Department of Education, it would have to be free, and thus involve a cost which the state was totally unprepared to meet.
6. Should the program be continued under welfare, it could be limited to families needing strengthening. This would presumably be based on established casework techniques and thus permit a tighter state control of eligibility.
7. The program could be dropped.

The Horan Report created a storm. Women organized public demonstrations and picket lines - one around Governor Dewey's home at Pawling. He refused to see them and called them Communists.

After receiving the report, Governor Dewey adopted the final proposal, and in December 1947 state aid was terminated.

A New York City committee of lay and professional experts, who countered each issue raised by the Horan Report, could not shake the Governor's determination to end the program. All efforts since that time to restore state aid for day care have failed,and the program has been operated as a local public program supported entirely by New York City funds, supplemented fractionally by private agencies, and the families who use it. However, the transfer in New York City from a wartime temporary day care program to a peacetime permanent one, was done without really settling any of the broad issues raised by the Horan

Report. Was the program a valid ongoing peacetime responsibility for which public funds should be committed? Governor Dewey found that it was not; New York City found that it was.

The Post-War Program in New York City.

This decision by the City of New York to continue the day care program, unlike most areas of the United States where programs were ended when war funds were curtailed, was accomplished primarily because of tremendous effort by the many persons and organizations which were mobilized into action to save day care. Community groups, churches, neighborhood committees, voluntary agencies, boards of directors and parents' groups joined forces in a massive campaign to make sure that the city took over where the state left off.

Among many others giving outstanding leadership were Mrs. Elinor Guggenheimer, Miss Helen Harris and the late Adele Rosenwald Levy. In fact, the Citizens' Committee for Children was founded in 1945 by Mrs. Levy and her colleagues as an outgrowth of the experiences of the Advisory Committee for the Day Care Unit of the Department of Health. Mrs. Guggenheimer (now a member of the City Planning Commission) went on in 1948 to build the present Day Care Council which she headed until 1960, when she formed the National Committee for Day Care for Children and became its first president. She was succeeded by Mrs. George Stewart who is currently the Day Care Council president.

With the cessation of state funds, the day care program was integrated into the city Welfare Department, and the Division of Day Care was created within this department. It was a natural evolution, since the program had been dependent upon welfare for space, funds and personnel. The Second Deputy Commissioner was given the executive responsibility, and the Nursery Education Consultant from the staff of the Mayor's Committee became acting director of the new division.

The use of voluntary agencies-and their financing assistance -- was continued as well, for their financial contribution was substantial at that time, although the percentage of that contribution declined substantially over the following years. Thus, the basic structure remained unchanged and incorporated the licensing activities of the Health Department, the private-public administrative arrangements and the counseling services.

Quality of the Program

Many changes in the character of day care occurred from 1940 to 1947. Staff became professional; the emphasis on custodial care was modified to include planned pre-school experiences; the few ill chosen toys gave way to standardized educationally oriented play equipment; unsafe crowded rooms were replaced by ample space specifically designed for young children. Standards for teaching qualifications were set by the Mayor's Committee and the Day Care Unit of the Department of Health. Because of the shortage of trained, experienced personnel, the Mayor's

Committee instituted in-service training courses for its teachers. A cooperative venture with the New York City Committee on Mental Hygiene was an added effort to provide the teachers, directors and counselors from the Information and Counseling Service with a psychiatric and psychological approach to understanding the needs of young children.

If measured by the qualifications of teachers, the types of buildings occupied, the flexibility of program, the health and social welfare services provided to the child and the family (using the seventeen criteria established by the National Association of Nursery Education), the quality of day care in the Mayor's Committee day care centers could be considered good. They did more than answer the needs of working mothers for safety for their children.

Despite the fact that the chairman was the Commissioner of Welfare, and the executive director, Miss Helen Harris, was a trained social worker, day care under the Mayor's Committee was never just a welfare program. It included the educational aspects of day care, and tried to incorporate the best knowledge and skill then known to the field of early childhood education.

At the same time, the welfare concept of day care as supportive of family life was increasingly stressed, and the goal of strengthening the family and avoiding permanent placement of children grew in importance. Today this is still a major objective, affecting character, intake and size of the program.

In summary, the New York City public welfare child care program today has unique aspects stemming from its history:

- the involvement of so many public departments, private agencies, community groups and parents' organizations;

- the appropriation of public funds and the close supervision of the use of such funds, not only by public authorities, but by private groups as well;

- the operation of the centers by private boards;

- counseling services limiting the program to children from families meeting a test of social and economic need.

IV

NEW YORK CITY'S DAY CARE - TODAY

What are the present goals, structure, size and policies of New York City day care? Can the New York City public-private day care program either as presently constituted or as it might be modified, meet broader needs?

Can it be expanded both in size and scope, so that more disadvantaged children in New York City may be helped to avoid the worst effects of poverty through access to an appropriate child development program?

Can the program become boldly preventive?

A thorough analysis of the structure and policies of the program can be provided only through intensive research. Some of the information gaps may be filled by Community Services Society in a study[43] now in progress. What follows is based on what could be assembled in a limited period with the cooperation of many persons.

The Dual Structure

The New York City day care program is still a public-private service.

The Division of Day Care, lodged in the Bureau of Child Welfare, asserts its responsibility over operations by setting personnel standards, supervising the expenditures and functions of each center and controlling the intake policies. The private boards actually operate the day-to-day center programs through Directors in each one; and the Day Care Council and its

44
Joint Policy Committee participate in decision making and policy matters.

Thus, there are two basic links between the Day Care Division and the sponsoring boards: the first, the Day Care Council; and the second, an administrative and supervisory staff to be discussed later.

The original purpose of the Council was to provide a means of access by the members of the sponsoring boards to the policymakers in the city Welfare Department; for originally the department chose to work with the directors and other professional staff, in effect ignoring the boards and their members. Members of those boards, feeling left out of day-to-day policy decisions, created along with interested parents, labor representatives, teachers and others, a Day Care Steering Committee and, later, the Day Care Council.

All agencies have two representatives who are entitled to vote at full meetings of the Day Care Council. They also elect a committee of six, the Joint Policy Committee, which is designated to meet regularly with staff representatives of the Division of Day Care and a member of the Commissioner's top administrative staff. The Joint Policy Committee has participated in many important matters of policy, reporting its decisions to the full Council and the Commissioner, subject only to the Welfare Commissioner's veto, since he remains the final authority.

According to spokesmen on both sides,[45] during the years of the Day Care Council and the Joint Policy Committee meetings, it has been possible to reach agreement on most operational issues, and together, the department and the private agencies have shared responsibility for developing policies affecting the administration. The relationship between the Council and the Commissioner has fluctuated, depending on the nature of the problem and the closeness of contact with the respective officials.

Evaluation of the Joint Policy Committee's power depends, to some degree, upon the point of view. Some have felt that this Committee has great power, and there is reason to believe that through the personal, social and political contacts of its important leaders, the Day Care Council exerts considerable influence on the local political authorities in such matters as improved personnel practices and standards, and increased appropriations. There is evidence, however, that the administration of the program and the way in which policies are implemented may at times serve ends that are in variance with Joint Policy decisions, and the Council is concerned about this. Staff competence, morale, teacher turnover and other factors involved in implementing policies may be more important in affecting the actual program operation than the state policies adopted by the Council and/or the Joint Policy Commitee.

In crucial areas of public policy, there are unresolved areas of concern to the Day Care Council and the Department of Welfare:

- the best means to expand the services,
- the ways of determining the proportion of financial burden that the sponsoring agencies should assume,
- the value of extra services contributed by the agency in calculating the budgets and the contributions by the city,
- the issue of per capita reimbursement through purchase of care arrangements.

The Day Care Council's records reveal that at times the Joint Policy Committee is more like a discussion group rather than a policy-making group involved in joint administration with the Department.

Requirements for Sponsorship[46]

The Joint Policy Committee minutes, dated 1954, contain the criteria for sponsorship of centers as follows:

1. The agency must be a non-profit organization which agrees to operate a day care center as a child welfare service where health, education and welfare of children are integral parts of the program.

2. The day care center must be operated without discrimination, on a non-sectarian and non-religious basis, both as regards children and staff.

3. If the proposed program is for pre-school children, ages three to five years, the agency must be licensed by the Department of Health.

4. The agency must agree to operate six days a week if necessary, 52 weeks a year, and the number of hours a day must be appropriate to the needs of parents and children.

5. Staff must be employed on the basis of specified written qualifications.

6. In order to determine the amount of public funds which may be granted, evidence must be presented in the form of an audited financial statement for the agency's last fiscal year, a copy of the current year's budget and certified records of attendance and enrollments.

7. The board must agree to raise through voluntary effort a small portion of the operating budget. (The exact amount has varied over the years, but now averages about two and one-half percent of the center's annual operating budget. The Division of Day Care negotiates with new groups as to the financial role they can play.)

8. The agency must be located in a neighborhood which has been determined by the Department of Welfare, through a registration process, as one in need of day care service.

Securing new boards is and has always been a slow and time-consuming process. One of the obstacles to day care expansion cited in interviews is the difficulty of securing boards willing to raise the two and one-half percent of the operating costs. There has been a tendency to use some of the stronger older boards to operate a group of centers.

Financing

Since 1947, when the city took over the state's share of financing, there has been constant conflict, both locally and state-wide, over the issue of state appropriation of funds, which have not been forthcoming. Also, from time to time, the threat of cutting the day care program from the city budget has become serious, but each time day care proponents have been able to mobilize such impressive support that city funds have always been voted, to be administered by the Department of Welfare.

In 1947, over $1½ million appropriated by the city represented about 70 percent of the total day care budget. For the current fiscal year, the city expects to spend $6,681,000 (89 percent of costs) in grants to the centers based on their budgets and daily enrollment, and $963,000 for administrative, supervisory, staff and operational activities of the Division of Day Care, bringing the city's share to over 7 million dollars. In addition, parent fees will account for $633,000 (8.5 percent) and the boards will contribute $190,000 (2.5 percent). The contributions of the private agencies has risen from $120,000 to only $190,000 over the years, while the city has increased its contribution from the same $120,000 to more than $7 million at present.

The New York City day care program costs close to $8½ million, with a per capita cost per child of about $1,300. The national average costs, according to Children's Bureau, is about $1,000 per year per child for full-time, five days a week, 52 weeks a year operation.[47] (A study in progress[48] is being conducted by Arnold Gurin at Brandeis University and financed by Children's Bureau to determine cost by activity units for comparative purposes. When it is completed, it may offer a model for evaluating day care budgets and services.)

There is concern on the part of the Day Care Council spokesman about the cost of this program, the public's attitude toward costs, and the problems generally of financing day care in New York.

Some years ago, the Day Care Council and its supporters considered as a pattern for expansion the public per capita purchase of day care from voluntary child care agencies, including those operating as religious and sectarian programs. The sectarian groups have always favored this as an extension of the similar financing pattern which is typical of most New York child welfare services.

This may well become a current issue, since the federal child welfare day care funds appropriated under 1962 legislation may now be used by states to purchase care on a per capita basis in existing voluntary or even commercial agencies, if it is in the best interest of an individual child.

There is however serious question as to whether per capita reimbursement would result in any immediate expansion of facilities, since there are already 100 centers operated under voluntary sectarian auspices, which might qualify for the first of such funds, and use them to finance present programs.

Whether this would ultimately release funds for expanded day care programs is a vital question, since the groups which stand to benefit from such a policy are the very ones at present who seek to restrict the service to carefully selected categories. Of course other issues enter into the decision, relating to philosophy of public-voluntary relationship, sectarianism and concepts of the nature of the program.

Administrative Staff

The director of the Division of Day Care, Miss Katherine O'Connell, is the chief administrative officer of the program and is directly responsible to the director of the Bureau of Child Welfare, Miss Elizabeth Beine. Miss O'Connell is a social caseworker by training and experience and earlier taught in elementary schools.

The assistant director, Miss Florence Kennedy, is the chief educational consultant responsible to the director. She is a specialist in early childhood education, and has primary responsibility for the supervision and in-service training of ten educational consultants.

These ten educational consultants play a major role in the operation of the program. They come from the same civil service list as the educational consultants employed by the Health Department. It might be noted here that the twelve Health Department consultants are responsible for over 17,000 children in 500 centers, as compared to the much smaller load carried by welfare staff. Since 1950, there has been an administrative agreement between the two agencies to prevent duplication of services.[49]

Welfare furnishes regular reports to the Health Department, there is a joint annual review and other joint meetings to review policies are held. The Health Department is represented on the Executive Committee of the Day Care Council. There is close liaison at the top level, and there seems to be a cooperative relationship between the two agencies.

The responsibilities of the educational consultants, each of whom works with ten centers, can be described as follows:

1. To interpret the Division of Day Care philosophy, standards, policies and procedures to the operating private agencies and to the directors of each center.

2. To work with the directors,and to help them in maintaining legal, health and educational standards, and in planning programs.

3. To supervise staff, program, the use of allocated funds and the preparation and application of budgets in the centers.

4. In cooperation with the Division of Day Care home economist to see that the centers maintain economical and efficient household management.

5. To help in matters of relationship between the director of the centers and the counselors, as well in board-staff relationships.

6. To develop a plan for work with parents, assuring an accepting attitude towards parents in the director, and suggesting methods and material for staff-parent communication.[30]

There is a second hierarchy of administrative staff composed of social work supervisors, who report directly to the Director of the Division of Day Care, and are responsible for the performance of the counselors (civil service social investigators).[31] These supervisors conduct in-service training and develop the intake and casework program.

Thus, the Department of Welfare through its administrative and supervisory staff exercises direct supervision and coordination of the practices and procedures of the centers. Without further study, it is difficult to know how successful this effort is in practice.

During interviews with some professionals in health and welfare, all of whom have had involvement with day care operation and policy, one concludes that the day care program in some aspects shows the effect of too rigid control by the Welfare Department staff of day-to-day operations. These critics decry what they regard as a tendency to resist innovation for fear of introducing dissension, conflict or difference of opinion. They believe that one of the main advantages which could accrue from the voluntary sponsorship pattern, namely, diversity of plans, is not permitted. Yet, according to other observers, the dual responsibility results in considerable diversity of an undesirable kind -- in performance and achievement.

Some of the private board members feel they have little power. One reason given to explain the difficulty in finding sponsoring boards is the lack of authority and opportunity for them to use discretion as to policy. Every administrative decision which varies from the accepted pattern as to equipment, method, procedure and program must be approved by the educational consultants, who themselves are ultimately subject to firm administrative control. Such critics feel that in this respect the program has grown "stale," and some of the earlier enthusiasm of the boards and directors of the centers has been lost.

Others note that there is an inherent problem in trying to enforce the necessary requirements and standards because of the division of responsibility in administration which exists in the two hierarchial systems. As a consequence, in the area of admission policy, it is difficult to know whether in actual practice the center directors make the final decision or the counselors do; areas of responsibility, which may be specifically delineated, are in practice implemented differently among centers. Much depends on the relationship between the director and the counselor, the experience and competence of respective staff and the quality of the boards.

The Education Program

The center is responsible for conducting the program in accordance with educational standards established by the Division of Day Care and the Health Department. The center director and the group teachers are required to meet state standards for certification. The education program is administered by the center director, under the board, and in consultation with the educational consultant. Only informal ties to the Early Childhood Division of the New York City Board of Education, based on sharing of interests, exist.

The sponsoring agency boards employ the teaching staff, usually in consultation with the department educational consultants. The teachers, who are not civil servants, work in accordance with the written personnel policies.[52] The following academic experience qualifications are required.:

For director and assistant director: a New York State Teaching Certificate or a statement from the training school, indicating that requirements for state certification have been met.

For teachers: a New York State Teaching Certificate or a statement from the training school indicating that requirements for New York State certification have either been met or that an approved study plan has been made.

For assistant teachers: two years of college.

Teachers who meet the certification requirements vary in their qualifications. Many day care teachers are from inferior southern colleges and some are German refugees. Thus, achievement in language mastery and verbalization by the children could well be affected by the problems which some of the teachers bring with them.

The qualification of the assistant teacher has been a matter of issue for many years, since it is related to the matter of the high cost of day care. While at one time, the Health Department felt that assistant teachers should be "on their way to getting their licenses," now the assistant does not need to be actively studying. It was found in the past that assistants tended to make plans to study in order to satisfy the directors, then did not carry them out. Also weak staff members were attaining paper qualifications and achieving status which gave them priority for job vacancies. Now there seems to be agreement that in-service training is preferable to formal education for such staff and plans are being developed to secure federal child welfare funds for this purpose. The effort to provide one qualified teacher on the premises at all times, based on an unwritten but enforced agreement with the Health Department, is a factor in the high cost of day care, and is a subject of criticism. Often, however, teachers' hours can be staggered to provide adequate supervision, and thus reduce the cost.[53]

This matter of the qualification of assistants is currently of real concern, since new programs in process will seek to rely on untrained child care staff and mothers of the children. Training child care staff is an objective of some of the new public school vocational programs as well as of the public assistance AFDC programs.

Health Program

There is a basic preventive health program in all the centers. The health services include immunizations, complete physical checkup upon admission and follow-up to see that the parents carry out the doctor's instructions. No treatment is offered directly by the center, but referrals for service are given. The health staff consists of a consulting pediatrician, who supervises the health program, nurse and home economist.

The Health Department, through the pediatrician and nurse assigned to the center, evaluate the adequacy of the total program from a health standpoint to determine whether there is a safe environment, a proper balance between active play, quiet play and rest and the necessary precautions taken in relation to fatigue, heat and exposure.

The premise that parents have the primary responsibility for the over-all health needs of the child governs health policies. All staff in the center are instructed in the use of the health resources of the community, including information on controlling infections and communicable diseases, handling accidents, keeping medical records and making referrals for special health services. The director is responsible for integrating health with educational and social service aspects of the program.

Employment Practices for Day Care Centers

Personnel policies formulated by the Joint Policy Committee apply to only those practices which affect the Department of Welfare reimbursement to the agency. In other words, an agency may pay for additional services and develop its own policies in regard to such services. An approved statement of personnel policies sets forth the hours of work, paid holidays, vacation regulations, sick leave and personal leave policy and termination of employment. All day care center staff members are eligible for Social Security benefits.

Beginning teachers' salaries in the day care centers are comparable to those paid in the Board of Education. However, the maximum salary that can be earned in day care is considerably lower than that paid in the public school system. Therefore, after teachers have had several years of experience, they seek positions in the school system, where they have a greater opportunity for advancement. It has been especially difficult to recruit educational consultants from among day care center directors, since many of the more able ones tend to leave for better-paying positions.

Hours of work is another issue of concern both to the staff and to the administration of the day care program. Centers serving pre-school children between the ages of three and six are open weekdays from 8 A.M. to 6 P.M., 52 weeks per year. The professional staff work 38 hours per week, which includes one-half hour daily of free time. They receive 24 working days vacation with pay during a twelve month period accumulated at the rate of two days per month. Compared to Board of Education work days, the day care staff are at a disadvantage.

The day care hours pose a problem of administration for other reasons than those affecting personnel practices. Children requiring the long day because their mothers work are given priority in admission. Some children, however, do leave at three o'clock and others are encouraged to stay home entirely when mothers have time off. This is consistent with the philosophy that young children are actually better off with their mothers. As mothers move in and out of jobs, some children move in and out of centers.

There are no data to substantiate how frequently this happens. Some have identified this practice as evidence of the constant concern with the child's absence from the mother rather than with providing some continuity to the child's educational and social experience. What effect such policy has on program quality, staff scheduling and group morale, cannot be assessed. It does point up the need in all programs to review policies in relation to the long hours. It also shows one way in which the goals and philosophy of day care have implications for its structure.

Space and Facilities

As the years have gone on, a growing number of centers have been able to move into housing projects. The Day Care Council has favored this, since the housing project space designed for community activities has continued to improve and is now more properly conceived for the group care of young children than most other types of available space.

In 1947, there were seven pre-school units in seven housing projects. By 1957, there were 42 pre-school units in 42 projects. Presently there are 64 - out of the total of 83. Fifteen more will be completed within two years, and sponsoring boards for most of them have already been found. Only 19 public day care units are in non-public housing. The use of public housing space also helps to avoid the sectarian issue -- perhaps another reason this is favored so strongly.

The Division of Day Care knows in advance all the new projects and which ones it can use. Often it is able to secure sponsors early who can participate with housing staff in the planning stages.

More recently, housing projects have been needing their facilities for other community activities, but day care still is usually given first consideration. The Housing Authority is currently experimenting with designs for multiple use of community center space, a practice which the Day Care Council has always urged.

The day care sponsors also have to meet certain criteria set by the Housing Authority. They must be incorporated, have a constitution, board, membership policy, carry appropriate insurance and submit a budget and statement of income. Most important, at least 55 percent of the children attending public day care centers live in non-public housing. It has been reported that children in the project who are excluded hang around the playgrounds and center building, begging for permission to use the facilities. Their families also consider the boys and girls who attend the center as specially favored.

In recent years, lack of adequate space has plagued the city in its efforts to expand day care, since project space becomes available slowly. Some blame the difficulty of finding non-public facilities on the high standards set by the Health Department and the Child Welfare League of America, which result in high repair and renovating costs in order to bring such available facilities up to required standards. Actually, Health Department requirements are quite minimal, and generally day care centers meet or exceed these requirements. In fact, the issue of space goes back to the early days of the Mayor's Committee when many WPA centers were located in schools. It is reported that the standards in these centers were so comparatively high that the elementary school principals were envious. As New York schools became overcrowded, there was considerable pressure for the centers to move out and make this desired space available for the expanding elementary school system.[54] The space problem is currently concerning the Board of Education also, and one reason given for the lack of public school kindergartens in many areas is this lack of space.

In fact, the Public Education Association and Day Care Council see multiple use space as the number one need in expansion of either day care or pre-school education.

Intake and Eligibility

In 1947, the agencies were very upset when the right to determine eligibility and handle intake was removed from the directors of the agencies and given to the newly appointed Department of Welfare counselors. Now there seems to be acceptance of this function as a social service.

The responsibilities of the counseling or social service staff of the Division of Day Care are the following:

- determination of the child's eligibility for admission to the program;
- assisting the parents in evaluating the use of day care for the child's benefit;
- working with parents to alleviate problems that threaten the security of the home.[55]

Criteria for admission involve consideration of specific factors of economic and social need which overlap:

- the inability of the parent to provide care at his own expense;
- economic problems requiring the mother to work;
- physical or emotional illness resulting in the absence of a parent from the home;
- poor and overcrowded housing conditions;
- families so large that the individual child receives insufficient attention;
- children who need group experience for physical or emotional reasons;
- day care as a means to prevent placement in foster care and preserve or reunite a home;
- any other circumstances which contribute to child neglect through depriving children of adequate adult supervision.

Thus, the social service intake function embraces both the determination of economic as well as social need and how the latter can be cooperatively met.

Parents come to the day care center to apply. A counselor qualified as a social investigator according to civil service requirements is assigned either to one large center (of about 90 children) or to two small ones (about 54 children each). Since there is much staff turnover, each one actually has to handle a larger load. The counselor makes the intake study and recommends admission or rejection of the child based on his eligibility, and the child is put on a waiting list. When a vacancy occurs, the center director must approve the child's admission, after an interview with the child and parents. If there is a disagreement between the counselor and the director, the case moves up the hierarchy to the Day Care Division administrator who may have to settle the conflict, subject to a final decision on the part of the agency. Where staff are cooperative and competent, the decision is a joint one. Since waiting lists are long, counselors, when inexperienced, prefer to leave the decision to the center director,* and the group's readiness to absorb a child with special needs may determine the result. Where a child is referred by a social agency, the counselor may be more active in pushing for the child's admission.

---

* In some other countries, such as Scandinavia, the director deals with social and economic data, handling the intake decision and the priority rating, since she makes the ultimate decision anyway.

In the California program all applications are made in the individual centers. The administrative officer in each center (head teacher) is responsible for interviewing parents when they apply, and final approval is cleared through a central administrative office. All applications are subject to periodic checking by the State Department of Education.

Financial eligibility and the fee for the New York City day care service are determined by estimating family expenses on a budgetary basis as set forth by the Department of Welfare.[56]

Allowable expenses in computing fees and economic need for a family of four, consisting of one adult and three children with one wage earner are estimated to be $65 per week, exclusive of the cost of shelter, (the amount actually paid), heating, and state and federal taxes. While this budget is higher than that utilized in determining eligibility in public assistance, it is hardly affluent.

Since available day care figures do not give family size, it is difficult to relate income *levels precisely* to city-wide data. We do know, however, that day care families tend to consist of four or more members. In family budget standards developed by the Community Council of Greater New York, the October, 1963, measure of an adequate budget for a low-income family of four with one wage earner and two children of 11 and 13, was found to be $125.51 per week. Even making allowances for a lower rate for young children, it is significant that in 1963, 75 percent of day care families had incomes under $110 per week and the median weekly total was between $80 to $89. Thirteen percent had incomes under $50.[57]

Clearly, a considerable number of fee-paying day care families are living on less than adequate incomes. What is more, since the Mayor's poverty report listed 317,000 families (not all with children) living on an income level below $3,000 per year, it is obvious that day care is currently serving only a small proportion of families with young children living in poverty.

All income and resources such as bank accounts, insurance, war bonds and property must be verified in the day care intake process, but verification can be flexibly handled. For example, some counselors do not insist on seeing the marriage certificate. Also, employers receive a blank to fill in for verification of employment, imprinted "Department of Welfare." Clients and sometimes counselors often tear this off to avoid embarrassment, and some counselors will settle for a pay stub. Despite such relaxations, many parents dislike the means test, claiming they pay fees, cannot see why they should be treated like relief clients and resent what they consider undue investigation.

The amount of the fee is based on a percentage of the difference between income and expenses and is contained in standardized tables.[58] No free care is provided, so no preschool child is admitted for less than the minimum fee of $2.00 per week. The family is financially ineligible when the difference between income and the estimated family budget would enable the family to pay a fee in excess of the maximum, or what would be tantamount to the cost of private commercial day care ($22.75 per week).

Based on a sliding scale, about 79 percent of the families pay the minimum fees, 10 percent between $2.25 and $5.00 per week, 7 percent between $5.00 and $10.00 per week, and 3.7 percent pay $10.00 per week or over. The average fee per child per week was $2.21 per week in 1963.

Counselors are also charged with the responsibility to establish social eligibility, which is seen as a more important criterion than economic need. In theory at least, a social history is taken of each applying family, to learn the nature of the child's relationship to his parents, his readiness for the day care program and whether this service or some other is indicated. A similar type of intake study is viewed by important members of the United States Children's Bureau staff as the "core" of the child welfare day care service, distinguishing it from other pre-school programs. For example, one federal staff member stated that the California child care program is not day care since no diagnostic study is made. Here again, as in many other public welfare programs, notably public assistance, the eligibility study also is seen as a case-finding device for early detection of incipient or unexpressed social and psychological problems.

In the New York City day care plan, counseling is supposed to be available at the time of application, on a continuing basis when the child is in the center, and after he leaves. Families may contact the counselor in relation to any problem they may have in connection with their use of the center or in their relationship with the child, and counselors are expected to be equipped to give parents information and help in using the services of other health and social agencies.

There has been constant discussion and concern as to whether the intake and counseling service should be assigned to trained caseworkers, rather than to the social investigators, to handle the complex emotional problems that come to the attention of the day care centers. Regardless of present staffing policies, both the Division of Day Care and the Day Care Council would like to be able to provide greater casework skills to troubled families early. They see this as a way to contribute to the control of juvenile delinquency and to general family stability. While there is no pretense that the present intake process is based on anything but a general type of investigation, they do feel that even under present conditions, families receive substantial supportive aid from the social investigators.

Others evaluate the situation more negatively. They note that the counselor's time is devoted not to casework counseling, but to the determination of economic and social eligibility and handling gross crisis situations, primarily at the point of admission. The counselors are in the main untrained and inexperienced. Although they receive three weeks orientation training, (conducted by the Bureau of Child Welfare), they actually start work immediately and even during the training period are often called upon to handle complex cases.

Several examples were reported in which voluntary agencies viewed the inexperienced counselors with little respect, and even disregarded their advice that day care services were an alternative to full placement for the children. Health and education officials also have stated that the counseling service is the weakest part of the New York program with respect to professional standards.

The counselor's work with parents after the child's admission is also focused largely on crisis situations. At the same time, there is reason to believe that the center directors perform a large and important part of the work with families through their daily contacts with both the child and his parents. There is, in fact, some evidence of competition between the counselor and the director for the parents' interest and cooperation. There has been general praise and positive comment from varied sources for the work with parents that many center directors and teachers perform. One must therefore question some of the formal role definitions. It may be that the need is for more selective access to casework in defined situations, rather than routine coverage and overlapping responsibilities.

Who Is Served Today?

A sampling of twenty percent of day care families and their children in New York City from June 1962 to June 1963[59] yields the following information:

Reasons for Admission

- the mother's need to work (77.3 percent)

- physical and emotional illness of the mother (13.8 percent);
- the mother was either deceased, hospitalized, or otherwise absent from the home (6.3 percent);
- the child's specific problem (1.9 percent)
- inadequate housing (.3 percent)

Extent of Program

As of the end of the period cited, there were 121 units in 84 centers caring for 6,857 children. This represents a growth from 1962, when there were 118 units in 82 centers caring for 6,515 children. The rise in numbers of children cared for in that year was 342, or about 5 percent.

In 1956[60], there were 4,824 pre-school children in such care, as against 5,518 in 1963, a rise of only about seven percent in seven years, the largest portion of which occurred between 1962 and 1963.

Family Characteristics

Ethnically, the report disclosed that approximately 30 percent of the children were white, 18 percent Puerto Rican, 50 percent Negro, (two percent were "other"); about 41 percent were Catholic, 47 percent Protestant, 7 percent Jewish, (5 percent were "other").

Sources of Income

In 70 percent of the cases, mothers contributed earnings and support, either as sole support (in 47 percent of the families), or in conjunction with a husband. In 12 percent of the cases, a principal source of income was public assistance or other benefits.

Marital Status

Because of death, desertion or separation, 47 percent of the day care homes were fatherless. In 41 percent of the homes both parents were present and competent, and in 10 percent one or the other parent was incapacitated, but in the home.

Occupations

Mother worked in offices (19 percent), factories (21 percent) or services (20 percent). Fathers were employed in sales (11 percent), services (16 percent), civil service (8 percent), but the majority (53 percent) had no employment or were out of the home.

Source of Referral

Over 85 percent of the children came to the day care centers through sources other than social agency referral. Most parents learned of the service through word of mouth from neighbors. Only 3.5 percent were referred by branches of the Welfare Department, such as the Welfare Center (Public Assistance) or the Bureau of Child Welfare. Only 8 percent of the cases were active in Public Assistance, while over 36 percent were listed as "closed Public Assistance." (This figure shows no change over 1956 statistics.) Seven and seven-tenths percent were closed foster care cases; that is, children previously in foster care who were returned home and were now in day care.

New York City Day Care as a Resource

New York City day care is defined as a child welfare service. It is the only public program of real size and scope under welfare auspices in the country. What are its possibilities?

On the basis of size alone, even if it were to double its capacity and thus serve the ever-present waiting list, the program would be inadequate to meet the need.

Preventing increases in scale or improvement in quality are these major problems: inadequate space, financing, inadequate teachers' salaries, unrealistic personnel policies and an administrative structure which becomes more and more difficult to maintain because of the difficulty of finding new sponsoring boards.

Children of families dependent upon public assistance or AFDC are served in limited numbers because the announced purpose of AFDC is to help mothers stay home. The poor and deprived children in AFDC families are the most vulnerable and most need opportunities for compensatory education, socialization, and developmental experiences, yet the program does not give them priority. There is a certain irony in the policy clash between AFDC, which seeks to keep mothers home and which aids only a small percentage of working mothers, and the day care policy which results primarily in serving working mothers. The result is that day care is usually available to the children of AFDC mothers only if and when they decide to work outside of their homes, which disqualifies them to some extent, at least, from assistance.

Thus, the present New York City program serves a limited, selective group of disadvantaged children. Its basic emphasis on protection determines admissions. It does not begin with the goal of providing compensatory pre-school education and developmental experience to children who need them. Such a goal would require changes in admission criteria and expansion of services.

Quality and Focus

New York City day care offers an educational and socializing experience which, in comparison with most such programs under private auspices, is of high standard. However, the educational standards are unevenly maintained, and questions of morale and of teaching excellence exist in sufficient degree to cause disagreement as to the overall quality of the program. One reason that day care has difficulty in securing adequate financial support is that it is neither education solely, nor child welfare completely. If it offered qualified casework generally, one could make a case for financing it at higher rates because of the high cost of therapy. If its educational program was generally and enthusiastically endorsed, another case could be made.

Financing

The possibility of early, significant financing for day care through the new federal funds is remote. The total federal funds available are meager, and the interest group conflicts, which arose in the past and will inevitably arise again around day care (discussed later in this report), will slow up governmental expansion of group day care. Such federal funds will undoubtedly "plant seeds," but the full growth of the program will have to be nurtured over many years.

It is a matter of speculation as to whether the Johnson Administration's war against poverty or racial integration funds will change the picture. Much of the new money for these purposes will probably go to educational institutions, yet some aid may be forthcoming to help provide group care for children while mothers, who now receive public assistance, are educated and taught skills as well as household management. Such a development would involve careful case selection, and thus would not support development of a new primary resource for large numbers of deprived children - a resource focusing an enrichment of children, instead of care to free their mothers for employment.

States may plan to use current statutory authorizations in several ways to provide federal help for day care addressed to the support of rehabilitative programs for public assistance (AFDC especially) mothers:

- day care may be purchased for individual AFDC clients from voluntary agencies,
- states may employ public assistance funds on a 75% federal matching basis for the purchase of day care (or other services) from other state agencies for individual clients needing rehabilitation provided there is a state-wide agreement between public assistance and the other state agencies. For example, public assistance funds

are now being used through a similar arrangement between the State Board of Education and the State Department of Welfare to provide literacy training to AFDC parents and other groups. The Education Department operates the program, and the Welfare Department supplies the major portion of the funds.

- also, public assistance funds may finance experimental or demonstration projects designed to develop new methods of coping with social problems. However, nothing on the horizon except the war on poverty would provide financing on a more direct basis for daytime care of children.

Change Potential

Since New York City day care is operated and financed entirely within the city, there are no state or federal obstacles in the way of new plans and directions. To be dealt with locally, in relation to possible new directions, are a complex bureaucracy with both formal and informal sources of power, and networks of professional, semi-professional and lay persons in many capacities.

On the other hand, the Day Care Council and other citizens' and professional groups have in the past shown themselves able to respond to new community needs. They might take the lead in promoting qualitative changes and a new scale of expansion if convinced of the wisdom of the direction. Similarly, there are public officials and some professional workers associated with the present program of day care who have shown interest in a non-needs test and more generally available type of community resources for younger children in deprived areas.

Educational Issues

Through the educational consultants and trained center staff every effort is made to offer what has in the past been considered good early childhood education. Also, some five selected day care centers are participating in a demonstration teaching project to test techniques for dealing with cultural deprivation in the three-to-five-year-olds, under the joint sponsorship of the Board of Education and the Institute for Developmental Studies, under Dr. Martin Deutsch's direction. However, it was the general feeling among educators interviewed that the present staff would require additional training to incorporate the new findings into a program somewhat more focused on intellectual development and cultural stimulation.

Much resistance to such a goal exists among the day care staff. The question of the readiness of disadvantaged children for more structured learning is raised constantly. Besides, the reality of salary scales compared to those paid by the Board of Education and other factors affecting turnover and morale must be resolved to upgrade the day care educational program. On the other hand, should day care move towards specialization, not broadening, and in the future accept more disturbed children, teachers would need special help with handling the emotional and psychological problems presented.

Summary of Issues Posed by Child Welfare Definitions of Day Care

1.

Assuming economic need as one criterion for admission, should day care be administered on the basis of an individual budgetary deficiency principle?

2.

Should day care continue to be seen as a service to carefully selected individual clients requiring the pre-admission diagnostic social study of a social worker, who, by United States Children's Bureau standards, should be a highly skilled, trained social caseworker? This requirement implies high cost, use of scarce skilled manpower and a service to the parent, especially the working parent, in a form which may or may not be acceptable.

Along similar lines, and given present day care concepts, if day care families need counseling services, should these not be rendered within the public assistance, child welfare and family agency networks -- with day care staff, particularly teachers and directors, focused on problems related to the child's daily adjustment?

3.

If, on the other hand, one were to assume the validity of an intensive social means test, making day care a service to troubled families, can this evaluation appropriately be carried out by untrained counselors? Evidence in the New York

City program is to the contrary. The program is set up on the philosophy of a social means test and its cost reflects this -- yet gross criteria are used. More specifically, child welfare goals give day care admission priority to those children who are already deemed to be suffering from physical and emotional neglect; but in practice, the working mother of necessity becomes the major consumer of the service. One does not need caseworkers for such priority rating. The program carries the restrictions of a case service and does not develop on the scale of a general resource.

4.

The present child welfare structure handicaps day care from serving those children whose primary need is for a socializing and educational experience even if their parents are at home much of the time (and whether or not they receive AFDC aid).

5.

The concept of day care as a child welfare service in which a caseworker evaluates need is often translated into the kind of control in which, for example, if the mother has a day off, the counselor decides whether the child needs the mother's care or should remain in the center. Yet rest for the mother on her day off may actually do more for the child in the long run, and perhaps she should make the choice unaided as a routine matter.

Finally, is not the degree of expansion of day care facilities and the scope of the program affected by the role the program is expected to play? As long as day care is considered to be geared mainly to solving existing or incipient emotional and psychological problems growing from child neglect and available through an individual diagnostic approach, its goals are restricted. Seen as a therapeutic social service, the program may expand somewhat, but will continue to be relatively small.

It can be argued that to see day care not as diagnostically selective individualized service, but as a form of "developmental provision" to enhance child rearing, would be more economical per child and would do much more to strengthen family life. It would certainly be a more comprehensive response to the main needs of deprived children. To define the need in group(i.e., all children three to five in certain neighborhood areas whose parents wanted them admitted) rather than individual terms would be to suggest the need for programs on a much larger scale and to eliminate individualized social admissions criteria. Where needed, in such context, individually selected social services could be made available to help children in the program, and their parents as well.

In conclusion, for New York City day care to play a larger and more dynamic role in relation to current social programs -- whether on the basis of child welfare traditions, or newer emphasis on compensatory experiences -- would require changes in goals, structure and groups to be served. The latter possibility, of course, assumes more change than the former. Undoubtedly these proposed shifts would bring powerful opposition from several quarters, but it is difficult to gauge the net result because there would also be strong support. The present period is one of shifting attitudes and values and, in the environment in which New York City day care operates, all the interests concerned are just beginning to feel the effects of new social forces. We offer the following review of major interest forces both past and present as they relate to our basic questions, in an effort to understand possibilities faced by the city.

V

SPOTLIGHT ON THE ISSUES

Since 1947, when state-financed support was terminated, constant efforts have been made to reinstate state aid for day care in New York. Considering that the State Legislature is the agency which normally must translate needs into effective action and that political interests and pressure generally seek compromises to effectuate agreements toward common goals, how did it happen that in the case of day care, not a single bill or appropriation ever passed the New York State Legislature?

During the early days, while Thomas E. Dewey was governor, the Republican majority in both houses was responsible to his leadership. His opposition was sufficient to prevent any of the many bills introduced from coming out of committee.

But he was succeeded by Averell Harriman, a Democrat. Still all bills died in committee.

There is an implication, at least, that the issues were of such depth and created such cleavage that compromise among conflicting interests was impossible.

What were these issues? What positions on these issues did various interest groups take?

The earlier state enabling acts were approved in an atmosphere of the prosecution of the war, and the existence of the Lanham Act. Thus, state aid to day care was predicated upon the issue of war mobilization. This took precedence over its inherent right or wrong. In the face of wartime needs, the questions of the desirability or undesirability of women working and the impact on family life of day care services were postponed for a later date. One special matter that may well have influenced Governor Dewey after the war was the objection raised by the Catholic bishops of the state to that part of the Horan Report which posed the possibility of placing day care in education; the bishops saw such a program as encouraging parents to surrender their responsibility to the state, and thus weakening family life.

All the usual sectional arguments came up. Day care was a city problem, not a rural problem. It was a New York City problem, not a problem of the upstate cities. These attitudes were reinforced as, toward the war's end, day care facilities upstate began to drop off in attendance.

The issue had sharp political overtones as well. The continuance of day care was sponsored by Democrats (from New York City) and opposed by Republicans, who were then in complete control of the legislature.

Civic Legislative League

An important but short-lived attempt to stimulate public support on a state-wide basis was the formation of the Civic Legislative League, which started in 1950 at the initiative of such groups as the Citizens Union and the Citizens' Committee for Children, and ended with the death of its director, Joel Earnest, in 1952. This league was designed to create an upstate-downstate alliance in behalf of legislation with special reference to child and family welfare. All of this took place during the Korean War when again there was an influx of women into the labor market.

Earnest, working throughout the state reported:[61]

1. The state's experience outside of New York City, with mass day care programs during World War II, had been less than positive.

2. Many in the social welfare community upstate were either apathetic to day care or not convinced of its value. Many welfare organizations seemed to fear more the creation of day care facilities than their lack. Only those already operating voluntary programs were besieged with applications and were favorably inclined toward expansion.

3. The absence of hard facts about the state-wide need limited the League's effectiveness in arousing either the Legislature or the total welfare community as to the need or value of such service.

When Earnest attempted, via letters, to assess the need in the upstate communities, he received what must have been some surprising replies. For the most part he was told: "local facilities are quite adequate to the demand."[62]

At that time, the welfare directors and staff of the upstate communities were political appointees, requiring no formal standard of education or experience. What little experience they had with day care was from their contacts with the "Lanham" nurseries, which in some communities were little more than parking stations for children, with poor food, inadequate staff and long hours.

Further, there was a decided feeling, as expressed at the time by the director of the Utica Community Chest and Planning Council to Earnest, that the most urgent community task was to "give every encouragement for women with young children to feel that their primary responsibility is to be in the home... this was more important to the community than an industrial job."[63]

History does not record to what degree such an effort, if any, was successful in Utica; certainly elsewhere women with young children elected, by choice or necessity, to enter the ranks of labor in ever-increasing numbers. This has been especially true in New York City, and the day care program has grown steadily in the face of this need.

Legislative Proposals

Not one bill - of literally hundreds offered - has passed. The same bills are introduced annually. They go to committee and are pigeonholed there. Only one such bill has passed one of the two Houses, to die in the other.

In aspects other than auspices, the various day care bills have been quite similar. All limit state aid to certain defined groups in the population who require care and protection for their children because of the necessary work of parents, the father's absence in the armed forces or parental inability to provide minimal care because of economic or social conditions. All bills have incorporated 50/50 matching by state and local governments.

Much of the post World War II legislation was patterned after bills which provided for half-day nursery schools within the education system. In 1951, however, legislators John R. Brook, Maude E. Ten Eyck, Archibald Douglas, Jr., and MacNeil Mitchell began to introduce bills to finance day care programs under the auspices of the State Department of Education. Neither nursery schools nor day care legislation received serious support either by the Department of Education or by the Legislature.

By 1952, legislative activity regarding day care was branching out and nursery education became a dormant issue. Bills were introduced assigning funds to the Social Welfare Department, the State Defense Council and the Youth Commission as well as the Department of Education, simultaneously. The Department of Education day care bill, which is annually introduced by Senator Earl W. Brydges, chairman of the State Senate Education Committee, is drafted at the initiative of a Mrs. Clara Cohen, a Manhattan woman who for years has constituted a "one man lobby," attacking what she calls welfare's usurpation of an "educational responsibility." She has had the attentive ears of responsible Board of Education officials, and her attacks on welfare give her access to other individuals in Albany. In recent interviews in Albany, it was reported that while from time to time this bill has caused some flurry of interest, little legislative sentiment in favor of day care legislation of any kind exists upstate.

In 1955, at meetings of the Joint Policy Committee, basic legislative issues of the day care program were reconsidered.[64] James Dumpson, the Assistant Commissioner and presently Commissioner of Welfare, discussed alternative methods of financing, and the possibility that some of the then recent state reimbursement procedures for general child welfare services might be applied to day care. However, it became apparent that such a move would redefine day care as a form of foster care. This would have firmly established the program as one geared to social and economic need, under the aegis of the Department of Welfare, tied by law and tradition to religious identity of child and facility "when practicable," and would have made it eligible for state reimbursement on a per capita basis. Nothing, therefore, came of this discussion.

In November 1955, Mrs. Guggenheimer, as President of the Day Care Council, reported that when a recommendation was made to the Temporary Commission on Juvenile Delinquency in Albany for the establishment of six new day care centers in New York City as part of the effort to combat delinquency, nothing happened because the sectarian question intervened. The issue as to whether the disbursing agency on the state level should be the Department of Social Welfare, the Department of Education, or the Youth Commission dominated the discussion, and was not resolved. Neither Education nor the Youth Commission appeared to want this responsibility and the active citizens' groups would not accept welfare auspices. In a letter to Mrs. Guggenheimer, an upstate day care leader said in part:

> "The three bills introduced provide that the program should be administered by the State Education Department. Our Catholic agencies take the position that this will prevent them from endorsing the program."65

In 1956, Senator MacNeil Mitchell again introduced a bill which was intended to place day care under the State Department of Education, but this department was explicitly uninterested in having the program under its jurisdiction. Therefore, Senator Mitchell reintroduced the bill and placed it under the Youth Commission.

This new bill proposed the establishment of a temporary state commission to assist local agencies in the development of various projects for the development, protection and security of children, and the provision of state aid to these projects.

Preference was to be given children with the greatest social and economic need. This bill as usual was initiated and supported by the Day Care Council, which believed that in this way, day care would be subject to the control of health, education and welfare; could expand its goals and eligibility; and most important, would continue its non-sectarian character.

A rival bill, also introduced in 1956 and supported by the New York City Administration, assigned state day care funds to the Department of Welfare, subject to the wish of this department that reimbursement be granted to voluntary agencies on a per capita basis. This bill was also supported by Catholic groups which hoped for public funds for their centers, operated under their own religious auspices.

For the next several years, the same pattern was followed. The city administration and the Department of Welfare joined in favor of a welfare bill, while Senator Mitchell was supported by the Day Care Council and other groups concerned with assuring the non-sectarian character of day care through a Youth Commission program.

Since 1958, scores of bills have been introduced allocating funds to all three departments respectively. Some legislators introduce several bills in a year, each one assigning responsibility to a different agency. However, little group activity has been generated in recent years, since it has become clear that unless the sectarian issue can be resolved in the matter of auspices, no legislation has any hope of passing.[66]

The state legislation introduced in 1964 showed the situation to be basically unchanged. In addition to the usual run of approximately fourteen day care bills, one bill was introduced reflecting the impact of the new federal day care legislation passed in 1962.

This bill, introduced by Senator MacNeil Mitchell and Assemblyman John R. Brook, Republicans from New York County, provided that members of the day care advisory committee required under the 1962 Social Security Amendments would be appointed by the Governor. It was initiated by the Day Care Council to give status and strength to the day care movement. Although the bill passed both Houses of the Legislature, it was vetoed by the Governor on the ground that there already existed a State Advisory Committee on Day Care, appointed by the Commissioner of Welfare.[67] The State Department of Welfare officially[68] supported the Mitchell bill and local Catholic welfare professionals indicated to the Day Care Council their support.

Nevertheless, we are informed that there was privately voiced opposition from both groups who feared loss of control over the expenditure of funds. At any rate, to date no new state day care bill of any kind has been passed and signed.

Sectarianism and the Religious Issue

Sectarianism has probably been the most serious single issue. Of the 500 centers (serving 17,000 children) licensed in the city of New York by the Health Department, 19 percent or close to 100, are operated under religious auspices, but not as part of parochial schools. In addition, there are about 50 (ten percent) which are operated by parochial schools and therefore do not require licensing.

The centers at issue have been those licensed ones which do not belong to the Day Care Council, and which, not meeting the requirements for non-sectarian programs, do not receive public funds. Although these programs are open to all children, there has been an unwillingness to give up religious garb, symbols and religious instruction.

The non-sectarian nature of the public day care program was established in 1943, when the New York Attorney General ruled that no state money could be used in the aid or maintenance of religious instruction, direct or indirect.[69]

The problem of religious sectarianism became a generally discussed public issue for the first time in 1952 when the Welfare Department announced that the day care program would be expanded and that St. Jerome's and St. Benedict's Nurseries would be taken into the program. The then Welfare Commissioner Henry McCarthy had requested $300,000 in the new budget to be earmarked for centers under Catholic auspices, which were soon to apply for admission. This was done without prior discussion with the JointPolicy Committee.

In a letter from Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen of the Joint Policy Committee to the Commissioner on March 21, 1952, a statement of the Day Care Council's position contained the following five criteria:

- admission on non-sectarian basis,
- selection of staff on non-sectarian basis,
- no religious instruction,
- no wearing of religious garb,
- no display of symbols.

Commissioner McCarthy indicated that he would accept the first three criteria, but argued that the use of religious garb and symbols were not equated with religious instruction. Further, he felt, the Attorney General's ruling in respect to religious education and the use of public funds applied to schools and not to welfare programs. Since day care was a welfare program, requiring a needs test and payment of fees, it was not within the purview of the prohibition established by the Attorney General's ruling.

Further, the Commissioner noted religious characteristics of other city-aided non-Catholic day care programs: the use of Kosher kitchens, the closing on religious holidays and the like.

The opponents of the Commissioner's position countered with the fact that day care teachers had to be certified by the State Department of Education; that the day-to-day experience of the child over the long period of time in the program was necessarily an educational one; that religious garb and symbols operated to exclude children whose parents objected; that such a position was setting a dangerous precedent, since the day care programs had always been operated on a complete non-sectarian basis. In other words, while operating a program in many ways tied to child welfare, the Day Care Council and others stressed the educational components.

Between 1958 and 1960, the sectarian issue again came to public attention with the introduction of state family day care legislation (primarily for children under three), when the Catholic agencies refused to go along unless the bill was amended to provide that children would be placed in a home of the same religious faith "wherever practicable."[70] This would have made section 373 of the New York State Social Welfare law applicable to day care whereas it now refers to placing of children in foster family and foster institutional care. Commissioner Dumpson took the position that section 373 would apply to day care, but that the "wherever practicable" clause would be liberally interpreted. Unhappy over this decision, the Citizens' Committee for Children wrote to the State Bureau of Child Welfare for clarification of the law. A letter dated October 29, 1960 contains the legal counsel's opinion, no. 63-12:

> "The provision of day care need not be restricted to persons of the same religious faith as that of the child."

It further clarified that section 373 applies only when a child is committed, surrendered, released, placed out, or boarded out. Thus it can be invoked only where custody is transferred. Since day care is for less than 24 hours and the child returns home to parents who retain custody, day care is not placement.

The question of state aid to day care thus becomes tied to issues in which stakes are high and feelings intense: the strengthening of child welfare through New York City's unique pattern of public subsidy of voluntary programs or expansion of direct public operations; the concept of whether day care is a welfare service or an educational one; the expansion of education provision in a fashion which some see as threatening to the fabric of family life (because the very young are involved); and the general concern about increased public endeavor.

Past Positions on Day Care Issues

In a search for clues on the positions likely to be taken on the future of day care, it may be useful to summarize briefly how various interests have reacted in the past to the issues raised in the legislative arena.

The City Commissioner of Welfare has consistently requested that day care remain under his jurisdiction, and the New York City Administration has steadily supported him. While the department itself is not free to lobby, it has issued statements stressing the importance of keeping the program focused on serving the needs of children for care and protection, i.e., a welfare-based program.

The Public Education Association and the United Parents' Association and other voluntary organizations have tacitly endorsed efforts to develop day care under educational auspices. Some educational officials have assisted these groups in drafting legislation.

Legislators who have introduced day care bills and signified support have generally been Democrats from New York City, especially from Bronx, Queens, Kings and New York Counties. Most of them have been members of the Committee of the City of New York. The Republicans whose names appeared on bills were also those who served on the Committee of the City of New York, notably Messrs. Anthony P. Savarese, Jr., and John R.Brook, Mrs. Dorothy B. Lawrence and of course Senator MacNeil Mitchell. The exception was Senator Earl Brydges from upstate Niagara County, who was the prime educaton spokesman in Albany. It is reported that Assembly Speaker Joseph F. Carlino and Senate Leader Walter J. Mahoney consistently threw their influence behind efforts to prevent day care bills from coming up on the floor for debate. This was attributed by some informants partly to their religious ties and the influence of sectarian lobbyists.

Among the non-governmental groups, the Day Care Council has given leadership in all day care legislative matters of state-local interest,and is the chief citizens' interest group in the field of day care. Recently, however, there has been a tendency to view the battle as hopeless as long as the Day Care Council insists on auspices outside of welfare. While these groups agree on the sectarian issues, they feel the power alignment in favor of welfare is too strong to fight successfully, unless brought out in the open.[71]

The Catholic groups interested in such legislation are represented at the State Legislature by Mr. Charles Tobin, secretary of the New York State Welfare Conference. The Catholics have consistently opposed state day care legislation unless it is put under the Department of Social Welfare and includes per capita purchase of care provisions.

Proprietary and independent schools, as represented by two organizations, the Metropolitan Association of Private Day Schools of New York and the Guild of Independent Schools of New York, have been active in opposing extension of day care in matters relating to state and local standard setting as reflected in licensing and compulsory registration.

The Metropolitan Association of Private Day Schools, representing the commercial day care centers, was organized in 1943 when the Sanitary Code regulations (now the Health Code) of the New York City Department of Health were first put into effect, requiring the licensing of all day care services. They have been opposed to such licensing from the beginning.

The Guild of Independent Schools represents mainly non-profit schools offering education running through both grade and high schools and has members over the entire state.

Issues on which these two groups have taken sides include the changes in the 1943 Code, which required that the standards for teacher qualifications meet those established by the State Education Department for the certification of early childhood education teachers and directors. The Health Department persisted in its efforts to get the private nursery schools to employ qualified staff and to bring staff members up to these requirements, and time was allowed for this. The two organizations also resisted the state requirements contained in the compulsory registration law, which was abrogated in 1948. Nevertheless, many of the schools had, or were in the process of getting, qualified staff; and all eventually met licensing requirements. Among other things, the 1959 Health Code requires that the educational director must be certified.

In 1959, in preparation for total Health Code revision, the Health Department reached local, state and federal organizations affected by standards. Conferences were held as requested by all interested parties, and responses were carefully collated and filed.

Two groups were specially dissatisfied with licensing:

1. Religious organizations - The three religious groups, Jewish, Catholic and Protestant were concerned lest licensing put church groups under the control of the state. When licensing goals were explained, however, the groups agreed to accept the

recommended requirements. They did not want any more regulation than was absolutely necessary, and the final decisions made by the Health Department reflected these views to some degree. A permit would not be required for a nursery school conducted by a religious elementary school, but such schools would nevertheless be expected to comply with provisions of the Code.

2. The proprietary and commercial schools - The Metropolitan Association had been relatively inactive for a long time, but in 1958, when Code revision was under way, it was reactivated to oppose changes.

In 1963, the Metropolitan Association challenged the validity of the Health Code through legal action. Among the provisions attacked as unconstitutional were the same five requirements: financial stability, a limitation of enrollment to children aged two and over, the qualification requirements for staff, the minimum allowance of playroom space and limitations on the use of the facilities. The court dismissed the suit, upholding the Health Department's authority to regulate with respect to health, safety, welfare and care of children within the city of New York.

The judge further found that there is no conflict between good health and good education, which reinforce one another; the "physical and psychological needs of children are inseparable"; and "when a legal statute results in reduction of income to some ... it does not establish a denial of constitutional rights."[72]

Until July 1948, there was compulsory registration of all private, independent and proprietary schools including nurseries and kindergartens. In 1947, the Guild of Independent Schools brought an action against the University of the State of New York involving a charge of interference with their curricula. The suit involved subdivision 5, section 625, of the State Education Law. This suit was lost in the lower courts, but won in the Appellate division. Thus, since 1948 no schools including those for pre-school children are compelled to register with the state. There is however voluntary registration for schools which include education as a purpose in their charter.

Some 20 public day care nurseries have voluntarily registered by including in their charter an educational purpose. They qualify for and receive program supervision from the staff of the Department of Early Education in the State Education Department. These are some of the older, better day care programs which trace their history back to WPA days.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Thus, in the past the active and indirect opposition to expanding publicly operated day care both as to size and function in New York State has included:

- Sectarian groups - primarily Catholic welfare organizations;
- most upstate Republican legislators;

- the proprietary and independent schools;
- welfare officials, who have acted to keep the program under their auspices and to limit its applicability;
- some public education interests, who either have stayed on the sidelines or covertly opposed their own involvement.

VI

THE NATIONAL ARENA

For the first time a federal peacetime provision for day care funds was enacted as part of the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments to the Social Security Act.

This legislation reflected a variety of developments and problems: continued increase in employment outside the home of mothers with small children; the increase in juvenile delinquency; evidence that available care and supervision of young children through private arrangements is largely substandard and unsuitable; knowledge that the voluntary and tax-supported day care facilities with a capacity of 185,000 serve only a small percentage of the nation's families needing the service; and the growing concern about the apathy and cycle of dependency affecting many AFDC mothers.

In response to unmet needs, numerous citizens''day care committees have been created from time to time. In May 1948, as a result of a meeting of five national agencies,* all of whom had a direct or indirect interest in day care, it was decided that a national committee should be formed to act as a prod group, so as to call attention to the problem of neglected children and to the need of providing group and family care for them during the day.

---

*The Child Welfare League of America, Family Service Association of America, National Association for Nursery Education, National Social Welfare Assembly and the Association for Childhood Education International.

In June 1960, the National Committee for Day Care for Children was incorporated as a voluntary, non-profit charitable agency:

- to interpret the needs of children for day care,
- to promote good day care standards,
- to encourage cooperative efforts throughout the country toward establishing adequate day care services for children,
- to stimulate study and research in the field,
- to encourage exchange of information, ideas and experience in day care.

In 1962, this organization effectively organized wide citizen interest to cooperate with concerned professionals in support of federal funds for financing of new programs. The day care provision was added to the proposed administration amendments to the Public Assistance and Child Welfare titles of the Social Security Act, primarily as a result of the pressures mounted by this group.

It was clear at the hearings leading to the 1962 public welfare amendments that the major thrust was to be in the direction of expansion of rehabilitative efforts through social services. If AFDC mothers could in the course of this be prepared for jobs, it would decrease dependency. Expansion of day care, seen as assuring care and protection of children of working mothers, would advance this end. Since AFDC had been conceived orginally as aid which would permit mothers of young children to remain at home and to care for them, the 1962 proposals created conflict and ambivalence, and reflected no small degree of policy confusion. But whatever the rationale, federal aid to day care emerged -- and its philosophy was in the child welfare tradition, to be administered by the United States Children's Bureau. Its objective was "to assist the states to provide adequately for the care and protection of children whose parents are, for part of the day, working or seeking work, or otherwise absent from the home or unable for other reasons to provide parental supervision". This program represented not a departure from tradition, but some modification in the light of new pressures.

In order to receive federal day care funds, the legislation requires a state to develop a plan to be approved by the Children's Bureau with these provisions:[73]

High quality of service and the necessary trained staff

Every facility in which a child is placed for day care must be licensed by the state or approved as meeting the standards established for such licensing. Facilities in states which are exempt on the basis of the auspices under which they operate - such as churches and fraternal organizations, from which care could be purchased under the new program - would need to be reexamined to determine whether they could be approved as meeting licensing standards.

Cooperation with health and education agencies

The state public welfare agency must set forth its plans for cooperating with the state health authority and the state agency primarily responsible for the supervision of the public schools, thus recognizing the necessity of a multu-disciplined team approach to day care on the part of these three professional groups.

Establishment of a state day care advisory committee primarily to develop greater acceptance and understanding of day care

A committee must be established to advise the state public welfare agency on the general policy involved in the provision of day care services under the plan. The law requires that this committee be widely representative, including professional people, civic groups, public and non-profit agencies and many other organizations or groups concerned with day care. The Children's Bureau, through its spokesman, has stressed that advisory committees in the past have spread their efforts over a multitude of problems and diffused their effectiveness.

Establishment of conditions of admission and eligibility of children to be served in accordance with the new amendments to the Social Security Act

The only children to be accepted are those for whom day care can be shown to be "in the best interest of the child and the mother and only in cases ... under criteria established by the state, that a need for such care exists."[74] Families who are able to pay part or all of the cost of care shall pay fees as may be reasonable. Priority must

> be established for low-income and "other groups" having the greatest relative need for such care, and for geographic areas. States are being encouraged to study their needs for day care as a basis for priorities.

The legislation, and the interpretations by staff of the Children's Bureau, would not appear to eliminate parents who are able to pay fees. However, the "social test" of need is underscored through insistence on a case study and intake process through "skilled casework services and the application of sound social diagnostic concepts in each case..... which should be provided as a child welfare service."[75]

Although the states are given some latitude in determining the specific way in which they will establish or extend their day care for children, as presently interpreted by the Children's Bureau:

> "The law established specific limits for day care services.... Other day-time programs for children, whose purposes are primarily educational, recreational or therapeutic are not included." [76]

Effect of the Federal Law[77]

The development of day care services within the child welfare program, particularly under public auspices, had been negligible up to passage of the new law. The funds earmarked for such service by the 1962 amendments may give impetus to the development of the program. The amendments provide that the amount of funds in excess of $25 million of the annual appropriations for all child welfare services shall be earmarked for day care services. However, the day care portion is limited to $10 million annually.

These federal funds are to be allotted annually among all states, in relation to each state's child population, per capita income, and total funds spent for child welfare; except no state shall receive less than $10,000 for day care services. Thus, a state such as New York, which spends more than the requirement for matching child welfare, does not have to appropriate additional funds to qualify for federal day care funds.

One provision permits states to purchase care on a per capita basis with federal funds from existing agencies operated either under voluntary or commercial auspices. The Children's Bureau opposed this provision as it could foresee that in many states child welfare funds would be used to purchase care from private agencies rather than to promote new public facilities. The state welfare directors pressed for this right since in most states there are no publicly operated day care programs and the states must depend wholly on such purchase of care arrangements.

The first appropriation under the 1962 amendments earmarking child welfare services funds for day care services became available on May 17, 1963, when President Kennedy signed into law a Supplemental Appropriation Act providing $800,000 for day care services for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

Thirty-one states moved to develop plans and had them approved for the fiscal year 1963. New York State had no plan ready and made no request for funds, despite pressure by the Day Care Council and supporting citizen groups. There was difficulty in deciding how best to utilize any new funds.

The appropriation of $4 million for fiscal year 1964 became available on October 11, 1963, after 42 states had already developed their initial budgets for the year on the basis of an expected appropriation of $8 million requested in the President's budget. They have had to review them and reduce their requests. New York State received $240,000 as its share, as contrasted with the over $8 million which New York City alone spends, and the state has not appropriated additional funds. (Federal appropriations for day care and New York State's share are the same for 1965 as for 1964).

By November 30, 1963, 43 states had approved day care services plans. Twenty of these states have already developed criteria for determining the need of each child for care and protection through day care services.

Twenty-eight states with approved day care services plans specify casework services. States vary in the base they use for determining the ability of families to pay part or all of the cost.

Many states have recognized the special needs of certain children for day care. The majority, 26 states, give priority to children from low-income groups. Three of these states (Florida, Minnesota, and North Carolina) specify migrant families and two (Florida and Mississippi) specify families receiving AFDC and other families from the agency caseload. One state (Mississippi) specifies priority to children of one-parent families where the parent is employed, and one state (North Carolina) specifies mentally retarded children. Eighteen states are giving priority to geographical areas with special need.

Of the 43 states with approved day care plans, 19 indicated that they expect to develop both group and family day care services;* nine states, family day care services only; four, group day care facilities only. New York is one of those developing only family day care. Many states are also using funds for needs studies and training of licensing staff.

The Federal Day Care Law in New York State

In accordance with the requirements of the federal law, a State Advisory Committee on Day Care has been established and Mrs. George Stewart, president of the Day Care Council in New York serves as its chairman. It functions in a purely advisory capacity to the staff of the State Bureau of Child Welfare. An examination shows that the members[78] are drawn primarily from the professional and lay social agency leaders in the state concerned with day care and one representative each from the official state health and education departments.

---

* Family day care is defined in Chapter II.

It is now planned to add additional representation from the fields of health and education.

New York Day Care Council members have pressed for a top level committee with political prestige and power, but so far have failed in their efforts. As noted earlier, legislation along these lines was vetoed in 1964.

The current state plan for the $240,000 federal grant provides that this money will be used for a $100,000 demonstration program in the field of family day care, a needs study in five counties (this has already been contracted for with the Child Welfare League of America) and for in-service training. The State Advisory Committee had little part in the original formulation of this plan.

More recently, the New York City representatives on the State Advisory Committee have demanded a voice in the decisions. As a result, an extensive in-service training plan was given high priority and the Division of Day Care was asked to submit a comprehensive plan. It has been reported that there are ample funds for a significant program, but the exact amount awaits the submission of a plan by the New York City officials. Thus, even this small amount of federal funds was not yet totally allocated at this writing and some have commented on the fact that the state seems to be having difficulty making up its mind how to spend the money.

Because the amount of money is so small, state officials decided that it should be used to assess needs and awaken interest in day care, primarily upstate. The consensus through the years has been that upstate communities do not perceive the needs nor understand the value of the service. By demonstrating the effectiveness of family day care it is hoped to stimulate new interest and awareness to counter upstate welfare officials' fears about publicly operated group care.

VII

CURRENT ATTITUDES

The environment within which New York City day care operates is unstable and shifting. The potential consumers of its service are increasing in numbers and in the severity of their needs and demands. The interpretations of day care's responsibility and the validity of its solutions are being re-examined. New agencies with related functions are being proposed, new federal legislation has been passed, new groups are demanding service and new theories of education and child development are being advocated.

Negro and Puerto Rican organizations are demanding their rights. Society is moving towards the recognition and satisfaction of those rights. The resultant social changes affect the entire context and potential of day care.

In the immediate background of recent events bearing on day care and the pre-school education of disadvantaged children are the on-going Deutsch experiments (discussed later) and the HARYOU proposals, referred to earlier. Behind these were Mobilization for Youth, Higher Horizons programs and the Ford Foundation Grey Areas programs.

The HARYOU program is a locally led central Harlem effort, sponsored originally by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, seeking "poverty program" funds to overcome the damaging effects of segregation and discrimination. The pre-school academies, recommended in its report, will stress the development of conceptual skills as well as social and emotional growth. Children will be admitted without payment of fees and without a means test. Priority will go to four and five year old "children in families most in need of child guidance." How this priority is to be established is not spelled out, but spokesmen are thinking of criteria based on developmental status, rather than a clinical diagnostic approach.

The program proposes to make available health examinations, referrals where physical or emotional treatment is needed and family counseling, probably of a group variety. The HARYOU report stresses that these programs must provide for the retraining of parents as part of re-education, and that there must be cooperation and collaboration with community agencies to obtain maximum benefit.

A second fundamental element in the current background is the experiment of Dr. Martin Deutsch, director of the Institute for Developmental Studies of the Department of Psychiatry of New York Medical College, who is attempting to demonstrate the effectiveness of a "Therapeutic Curriculum" for the socially deprived pre-school child. This research has led to much rethinking among educators. The program, financed by the Ford Foundation and the Board of Education of New York City, and carried on by the Institute, is designed to test the possibility of successfully reversing the psychological and intellectual effects of social and economic deprivation. Deutsch postulates:

> "It would seem that the child from the pre-school and enriched kindergarten classes might best remain in a

> special ungraded sequence through the third grade level, a period in which he could be saturated with basic skill training, and not be allowed to move on until he has attained basic competence in the skills required by the higher grades." 79

His work challenges the presumption that children are not ready to learn cognitively before the age of six. On the contrary, Deutsch feels that stimulation towards cognitive learning for those suffering from environmental deprivation must be made at a special time and within particular time limits to be effective. He includes in his term "cognitive learning," language expression and comprehension, knowledge of the facts and mechanics of the physical environment, handling and relating concepts and comprehending symbol representations.

According to Deutsch, 80 this time is more narrowly defined by J.P. Scott as the time of "initial socialization," which both he and Jean Piaget believe to be at the age of three to four.

> "It is at this three-to-four-year-old level that organized and systematic stimulation through a structured and articulated learning program might most successfully prepare the child for the more formal and demanding structure of the school."

While not unchallenged, Deutsch quotes Hunt to show that the counsel from experts on child-rearing during the third and fourth decades of the twentieth century, to let the children be while they grow, and to avoid excessive stimulation, was highly unfortunate. Today's investigators, through their new findings, see the stimulation of cognitive growth as a primary therapeutic method for developing positive self-attitudes and a meaningful self-realization for the lower-class child. The goal is to assure that deficits which are ego-destructive do not become cumulative and thus permeate the entire future functioning of the child.

How will the new ideas and forces affect the various special interests concerned with these problems and programs? There are inevitably those who resist change. There are also those who demand change, and they are divided in their advocacy of different pathways.

In the course of this exploration, attention was addressed to the attitudes that might be anticipated among day care leaders, and those in related activities, both lay and professional, with respect to change. There are those who have vested interests in preserving the status quo; there are those who consider day care as a minor and ancillary service, and cannot quite see what all the fuss is about. There are those who note great potential importance in day care, fully expanded and fully implemented, fully rounded to include care, protection, education and the redress of disadvantage. Some define it as a major force in the breaking of the poverty cycle.

This exploration included review of the opinions and attitudes on these matters of about 60 lay and professional leaders, including those at the local, state and national level.[81] They were persons of prestige and power who represent the important interest groups involved in health, education and welfare.[82]

Characteristic of the positions was broad agreement on many areas, with variations on some. It would be reasonable to assume that those who are in substantial agreement would overlook the minor areas of disagreement and join forces to achieve specific programs.

The basic issues upon which opinion and attitudes were sought include the following:

- Is day care an institution of central concern? To what extent?
- How is the need for day care defined?
- What is the potential of day care, as a child welfare service, as an educational function, or something else?
- Should it be expanded, and to what degree?
- Under whose auspices should it be controlled, directed, and financed? At what level of government?

Local Welfare Officials

Since the day care program is financed locally, New York City can make such changes as it deems appropriate, without the necessity of conforming to state or federal law. Thus, the attitudes of its officials with reference to the questions set forth herein are central. Of course federal financing under the poverty program, should it develop, may impose new requirements.

Some difference of viewpoint exists between the very top echelon and the staff below as to what can be done to fill the now recognized need for expansion of day care.

The local Welfare Commissioner's reaction is critical to any conjectured change, for it would be his responsibility, as Mayor Wagner's welfare authority, to propose and implement new ideas. Mr. Dumpson's public position is that day care in New York City must be expanded drastically. He has recently stated that the first responsibility is to provide for the 4,000 children now on waiting lists. If implemented, this goal would virtually double the present size of the day care program. How this is to be done no one knows; nor are plans yet available to develop day care for the 300 AFDC mothers to be trained under Mayor Wagner's recent poverty proposal.

In a published article, the Commissioner said:

> "Day care is one of those basic child welfare services that should be available to every child who needs it and can productively use it in order to reinforce the growth process of the child in his own home. ... I, for one, reject the use of day care as substitute care primarily for the purpose of permitting or forcing the mother to work. ... The phrase 'day care centers for children of working mothers' too frequently is interpreted to place the emphasis on working mothers rather than on the growth experience it provides to the children. When this basic child welfare service is not used primarily because of its contribution to the physical, emotional, and intellectual well-being of the child, it becomes a disservice to the child and, as such, loses its validity for use. ... Although the educational component of a rich day care program is important, the day care program should not be a substitute for the public's responsibility to provide kindergarten facilities and services as part of its broad educational program. I view the day care program, again, as a social service for children and their parents. As such, the decision to use it must meet the same criteria of eligibility that any other child welfare service meets - is it designed to strengthen parent-child relationship, to support and protect the family unit, and to contribute to the social and emotional growth and development of the child and the members

> of that child's family? ... I am particularly interested in seeing day care centers enrich their programs with an eye toward the culturally deprived child, since this would undoubtedly enhance his readiness for the formal education program when he is of school age."83

This position supports strengthening and expansion of day care in what might be called a progressive child welfare context. There is a broad concept of need and service, but the case is selected as meeting child welfare eligibility criteria, not because a parent decides to enrich a child's experience. An intake worker, diagnostician, counselor-somebody-intervenes to evaluate the need.

Some top welfare staff members question whether day care should in fact even be expanded to include 4,000 children who are now waiting, or whether better ways could be found to expend funds on measures designed to help mothers keep children home, such as higher assistance benefits, homemaker services, part-time jobs and other social services, which would convince mothers to delay entering the labor field whenever this is possible.

A short-day educational program, particularly for children whose parents are at home, of which the AFDC mothers constitute a major group, would be favored. In the face of the additional need for facilities for 4,000 more children of working mothers, some of the top staff members agree, that, even if desirable, a welfare program going beyond the scope of present goals is indeed in the distant future. In their opinion, attempts to absorb new and broader responsibilities into the present day care program would be as difficult or possibly more difficult than setting up an entirely new program with a new structure.

Mr. Dumpson, who as a board member is sympathetic to the goals of HARYOU, calls attention to the need for additional services to disadvantaged children, in order to break the cycle of poverty. However, he does not propose the current child welfare day care program as the vehicle for this service. He sees something different from child welfare day care as conceived above. He suggests that a new program probably must be set up, with a new name, new personalities, new purposes. It could be under the administration of welfare authorities by virtue of their long experience in the field, but might possibly be placed under wholly different auspices. The Commissioner suggests the enormous problems inherent in creating a new program -- in staffing, housing, financing and administration.

In short, the present day care structure is a complex instrument in relation to the new goals. It is based in the child welfare concept. A rapid reorientation of goals would be difficult and not necessarily desirable, a conclusion borne out in interviews with staff members. A new agency probably would be easier to create than would be the needed degree of modification of existing institutions.

Some staff within the day care program who were interviewed voiced concern at the "danger of putting pressure on children to learn early," and others saw a peril in encouraging independence at such an age. They want to strengthen educational programs in public day care as it now exists, but are "waiting to see" what new educational innovations will prove effective. They are skeptical of the current emphasis on more intellectual stimulation for young children and feel the newcomers to the early childhood field may be starting where they left off many years ago. They feel day care will always be ready to incorporate any new findings when they prove to be effective, but that there is a great deal already known about the need for socialization, cultural enrichment and helping children to verbalize and develop language facility. The problems rest in how to implement such goals rather than any difference of opinion that such goals are needed.

Still others saw an expansion of day care to the status of a primary resource as leading to a welfare state, and they felt that government funds should not be used to expand services which might encourage parents to relinquish some of their responsibilities to an agency. Professionals with this latter position propose as primary goals efforts to reverse the trend towards increasing employment of mothers. They urge programs to make it feasible and attractive for mothers to remain at home and thus to eliminate the need for more child care services. Precisely how to reverse a social trend is beyond them; they see only the desirability of this solution.

Attitudes expressed at important points within the program and the department tend to confirm the judgment that if there are to be new goals, they would probably require a new program.

The Commissioner also notes that New York City could not possibly finance a new program of child care from its own welfare funds; that the funds from the federal day care provision are presently and would probably in the future be grossly inadequate; and that the only foreseeable resource would either be funds from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, or from the war on poverty program, or a combination of both.

Federal and State Welfare Officials

While the New York City program is a financial and administrative entity, its officials are influenced by their professional goals and commitments, as well as by what state and federal resources may be available. Strong pressure for change from state and federal groups could influence local action.

State welfare officials, and their federal and local counterparts, all favor the retention of day care as currently conceived as part of welfare, and restricted to serving those in need by welfare definitions. When new possibilities are posed, many state welfare officials raise the issues of financing, auspices, sectarianism and legislative opposition; they see no hope for any immediate shifts of importance in New York.

They too agree that programs are needed for cultural enrichment of disadvantaged children, especially those in public assistance families, but it then becomes an educational problem (with possible financing as such) and the responsibility of the school system.

These spokesmen have not advanced any answers as to whether and how the school can offer new services for younger children or whether public welfare programs can assist. They fear a long day that is too structured, yet see the need for a full-day program for many children. Since such an extended program begins to approximate day care, confusion results. On the one hand, welfare officials see no role for themselves; yet on the other hand, many find it difficult to relinquish all-day responsibility to education.

Generally, federal and state welfare spokesmen who were interviewed advanced the idea either of a school program or of an entirely new agency or institution to assume the responsibility for services directed toward the pre-school needs of the disadvantaged child. They have no specific suggestions as to how welfare funds or staff might be utilized in cooperative planning with education, but would undoubtedly develop proposals if asked to do so in the face of concrete possibilities.

Federal and state officials see their prime current role in day care as the implementation of the new 1962 federal day care program; first, through increasing public support and understanding of the program -- "planting seeds" -- and later, by leading to an expansion of facilities. The law, it is believed, has firmly established day care as a child welfare service.

Within this framework, federal participants see significant opportunities for state demonstration projects with wide discretion to develop new uses for day care and to involve considerable community planning. Some experiments, under way or contemplated by child welfare agencies, include those which are part of the Appalachian programs for culturally deprived children. Another is proposed in Rhode Island specifically for public assistance families. In a third one in Syracuse, New York, group day care will be offered as part of a neighborhood service effort, involving health, welfare, education and housing and using funds from a variety of sources. Since the latter two projects are in embryonic stages, and policies have not yet been approved in Washington, the importance of the role of education cannot be assessed. However, federal funds, even where community planning is involved, may only go to welfare agencies for operation or research. Federal day care money, for example, could not be allocated to the Philadelphia program where the Board of Education operates day care, even though its cost is an item in the local welfare budget, transferred automatically to education. In fact one interviewee was not even sure whether, should federal funds for group day care become available in New York State, the New York City program would qualify as a welfare department operation because of its private sponsors.

Federal officials view conditions in New York City as atypical, since the bulk of the city's child welfare programs consist of private and public foster care placement services, rather than services to children in their own homes. Day care here is more influenced by placement concepts and philosophy than in most places.

Important federal public assistance officials feel that the net effect of the new federal funds will be to stimulate over a long period voluntary agency family day care, rather than group day care.

Federal child welfare officials are more enthusiastic and hopeful for group day care than are public assistance staff. They see the new laws as making the service legitimate in their terms and providing new areas wherein to use their professional specialization. They are anxious to maintain the distinction between welfare and education. In response to questions as to why their statement of day care's purpose as formulated for the 1962 welfare amendments did not include care, protection, and development (and despite the fact that the new law requires that advice and consultation from health and education experts be incorporated in program planning and operation), they are quick to point out that this would connote it as an "educational program" and would be confusing.

Education - Local

Spokesmen for the educational system of New York City have been beleaguered by civil rights pickets, beset by financial problems on all sides, and are still adjusting to the dramatic changes of leadership in the past few years. When considering the problem of increasing facilities for younger disadvantaged children, they think first of expanding the kindergarten program, which presently has 84,000 enrolled and leaves large numbers of children unserved.

However, there was general consensus in the group interviewed that the Board of Education must and probably will begin to assume responsibility for developing programs for disadvantaged children down to age four, sometime in the future. They see such pre-kindergarten classes as running for a half-day, with two groups per day using the same facilities. The present research to develop a special curriculum for this age group, conducted by Dr. Deutsch has given them hope that such classes are for the first time a possibility in New York City. Thus, a shift in attitude among local educators has accrued in at least several areas:

- a new recognition that disadvantaged children especially need a broad instructional curriculum at an early age and that it should be conceived in developmental terms;
- that the program must emphasize verbalization and language development for intellectual stimulation;
- that such early education should be the administrative responsibility of the school system;
- that the disadvantaged child in poverty areas should have priority;
- that Welfare Department resources and joint planning would be welcomed.

However local officials point to an array of stumbling blocks which make difficult any early implementation of such a program on a large scale. Planning for such children, they note, includes consideration of the following problems:

Transportation. All children will need to be taken to and from school.

Space. There is a general space shortage to meet even present school commitments.

Class Size. It would be extremely undesirable to duplicate for younger children the present high child-teacher ratio prevailing in the New York kindergartens.

Teacher Shortage. In view of the already serious shortage of competent teachers for the lower grades throughout the state, teacher training programs would have to be stepped up.

Problems Presented by a Short Day for Children of Working Mothers. While the school, unlike welfare, does not assume a protective role during out-of-school hours, the results of inadequate, or no after-school supervision would necessarily confront school authorities.

Health Problems. More prevalent among young children are illnesses which mothers ordinarily cope with but which now the school would have to assume responsibility for.

Economic Deprivation. Malnutrition or lack of proper clothing would present special problems.

Work with Parents. Among many of the seriously deprived families, apathy and low aspirations have become chronic. Focused efforts to mitigate the effects of long periods of dependency and poverty on parents would be needed.

Administrative Adjustments. Since presently one superintendent already administers a large complex staff and programs for many children, there is fear that young children who require much individual attention will be lost in the shuffle.

In other words, the glaring inadequacies of the present school system pose such staggering administrative, financing and resource problems that it is difficult for many educators to view new programs as within the realm of immediate action. In addition, one might add, the goal of school integration will further complicate the task.

When the requirements of a new program were discussed with school officials, the use of school social workers to help parents use the new services was stressed as a desirable adjunct. The need for older boys and girls to help in transporting children to the school was suggested. Note was made of the need for social work personnel to help involve the community. It was felt that the Welfare Department should be a partner, but not the operator.

There seemed to be a difference of opinion between educators on the top level and those holding line positions in regard to how much involvement with the community, especially work with parents, teachers in programs for the very young could be expected to carry. Some of the staff felt that work with parents and parent education has to be the responsibility of the school. Others on a higher level did not feel that teachers could teach and still carry on the amount of community involvement which would be required.

In general, there was a positive attitude toward the Deutsch experiments geared toward developing better curricula and programs for pre-school children. Proposals like HARYOU were seen as powerful ideas which in time would affect local planning of educational services.

The first concrete results are contained in the recent city deficiency appropriation of $800,000 for expansion of kindergartens. In addition, a state civil rights advisory panel appointed by State Education Commissioner Allen has recommended pre-school classes. A report by a City Committee for More Effective Schools has recommended the development of ten special schools, each to cost one million dollars and to start with pre-kindergarten education on a full-day, year-round basis.*

---

*Since completion of this report, the More Effective Schools program has been started. Included are 16 pre-kindergarten classes for 240 four year olds and one class for 12 three year olds. With the exception of a few which run from 9 A.M. to 3 P.M., these are all half-day classes. Classes for 240 additional four year olds are planned. It is too early to evaluate this program.

State and Federal Education Officials

On the state level, it is necessary to distinguish between the members of the Commissioner's office and those who are heads of bureaus in the State Department of Education. The spokesmen for Commissioner Allen are groping for ways to meet the new needs, and on-going experiments are viewed with interest. It has been reported that there has been at least one meeting between the Commissioners of Education and Welfare to explore ways in which the two agencies could cooperate in educating the deprived child.

However, while state staff see services to pre-school children as definitely belonging within the school system in New York City, they see financing as the major problem. One of the spokesmen proposed that a financing formula similar to the one being used by the New York City Board of Education in its "600 schools"* (a higher reimbursement rate per pupil) be applied.

On every level in the Department of Education there has been some reassessment of the role of the pre-school program as part of the total educational ladder which the child must climb. Since New York has been the center of most of the new proposals and much of the experimentation, there is more enthusiasm and interest on the part of the state and local persons than among the federal educators.

---

* A "600 school" is designed for pupils with special emotional and/or social problems.

One state spokesman reported that her office is besieged with requests from school principals throughout New York for information about curricula for pre-school disadvantaged children.

Much of the planning interest is related to lowering the admission age to the age of four. There is less interest in a more extensive, longer day care type program, except as one could be developed under some kind of joint sponsorship with welfare and other planning groups. Suggestions that education handle the one part of the program and other planning groups assist in the development of auxiliary services met with some interest. This has not been thought through, nor are any definite ideas available as to how it could be accomplished. It was felt, however, that through the establishment of special boards including health, welfare, housing and other interests, some type of neighborhood planning approach could be developed.

All educators interviewed saw a major advantage in the fact that in a school program there would be no fees charged; all children in a particular neighborhood could have access to the service; and larger numbers of children would be reached without an individual means test. In discussing the planning boards, some of the spokesmen advocated that areas smaller than school districts be developed.

Educators generally see the importance of giving priority to the disadvantaged child, but all hope that in the future the middle-class family would also have such services available through public auspices.

There is no doubt that the pressure to meet the demand for integration and greater opportunities for minority groups, as well as the stress on better education to eliminate dependency and poverty is forcing top planning and administrative educational authorities in the state and city to take a new look at these problems and seek new solutions.

In contrast, at the time of this exploration, officials in the United States Department of Education saw the war on poverty as more the concern of the Labor Department and anticipated little change in education for young children. They were more concerned with extending kindergarten to all, since nationwide this is far from a realized goal. They are less subject to direct pressures of the social protest movements, and those interviewed appeared more firmly entrenched in their own specialized roles than any other groups approached in the course of this study.

Voluntary Educational Organizations

The National Association of Nursery Education is currently campaigning to increase its membership to 10,000 representatives of teachers, educators, and parents in education and related fields. It is supported by a substantial foundation grant. This organization hopes to become a potent force for reaching and developing wide public support of extension of nursery school education. It would like to integrate its efforts with the American Public Health Association, and if possible, the National Committee for Day Care for

Children. Cornelia Goldsmith, formerly Director of the Division of Day Care, Day Camps and Institutions of the Department of Health in New York City, is now editor of the organization's Journal of Nursery Education and is active in the drive for a reinvigorated effort. She has long been a proponent of the educationally oriented full day program for child development, broadly focused and available to all young children. Her long years of experience as a specialist in early childhood education have not diminished the enthusiasm she displays over the new possibilities emerging for important steps forward in this field.

Others in the group of early childhood education have in the past preferred to stress what they called a "global cognitive approach," emphasizing especially the emotional and social development of the child. These specialists, including day care educational staff, as well as staff of the teacher training schools, tend to feel that good early childhood education people have always done what the newer research points toward. In fact, some deplore what they see as a negative effect from the Deutsch experiment. They report that some teachers in the New York day care program are putting too much pressure on early reading.

Finally, it must be noted, it would be difficult to incorporate rapidly new findings into the internal educational program of the New York City day care program. Educational consultants share a professional defensiveness, having been trained in older ways and methods. For example, they probably would not be qualified, without in-service training growing from a total educational plan, to accept and use such curricula as may be developed in the current research.

Sectarian Welfare Groups - Catholic

Catholic welfare spokesmen, an important city and state force in social welfare, have consistently opposed legislation favoring broad extension of day care. Their position was expressed at the hearings on the 1962 amendments before the House Ways and Means Committee of the 87th Congress in the testimony offered both by Mr. Charles Tobin, secretary of the New York State Welfare Conference, and Monsignor Gallagher, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities. Mr. Tobin stated:

> "We are deeply concerned that the proposal for federal support of day care program has been presented without an adequate showing that the provision of such services will serve to strengthen family life of those who are receiving public assistance. Unlimited day care services ... will weaken family ties, by encouraging mothers to leave their children in day care facilities while they pursue activities which do not directly contribute to strengthening family life. ... We urge that ... it be limited to 'programs under the auspices of welfare agencies with rigid intake standards.'" 84

Monsignor Gallagher stated:

> "We are alarmed by the assignment of millions of additional children to public day care program, as this bill proposes. We support day care for children of those mothers who must look for, or work at, a job as part of the program of self-rehabilitation. We believe that it is un-American to place such large numbers of children

> under governmental care in order to free so many mothers of young children to enter the labor market when there are so many able-bodied fathers being supported under other sections of this proposal. This proposal would bring under government care millions of additional children. I believe it is correct to say that our form of government does not particularly espouse the unnecessary consignment of child care for millions of children to a governmental agency. This smacks of ideologies different from our own."[85]

Both spokesmen wanted day care limited to public assistance applicants or recipients, or to children of mothers who for therapeutic reasons or because of severe economic need must work to improve the life of their families.

Local Catholic spokesmen stated recently that they were deeply concerned with the damaging effects of long periods of dependency as reflected in the apathy of many AFDC recipients, and that day care could be a useful service in such cases. They would prefer better income maintenance programs to help these mothers stay home. At the same time they view with alarm the growing size of the "welfare dollar" and the extension of direct government involvement. They favor the granting of government funds to private agencies to perform the necessary rehabilitative services on the basis of careful diagnostic study, with appropriate needs tests.

Catholic leaders want a high quality of education in all day care programs, focused on disciplined instruction, including of course, religious instruction. This is based on the argument that day care is an extension of parental care, and one of the parental responsibilities is religious education. They look, however, with apprehension upon educational experiments concerned with preparing very young children for school, as they fear these might lead to an extension of public school nursery programs. Educational funds for this purpose, of course, would not be available to parochial schools.

Catholic agency attitudes therefore have not changed basically, except that in recent months there is reported to have been more cooperation between local Catholic welfare leaders and the Day Care Council in support of state matching funds for federal day care implementation. Further, Catholic leaders offered to support the measure which would have enhanced the stature of the State Advisory Council on Day Care, the bill which Governor Rockefeller vetoed. Also, there is the feeling among some day care leaders that less hostility now exists on the part of the Catholic welfare leadership towards non-sectarian day care programs.

Also, it has been reported that local Catholic welfare leaders have recently requested assistance from the Day Care Council in regard to program planning for their own centers. They have initiated this action in order to secure some sort of liaison and consultative arrangement whereby they can utilize the experience of the Council without an organizational tie. In interviews they stated that since they must accept, however reluctantly, the fact of increasing numbers of women working as a current social phenomenon, they feel impelled to expand and improve their sectarian programs.

Catholic children in great numbers use the public kindergartens, as the parochial schools have found the program to be beyond their means. Further, 41 percent of the children in the public day care program are Catholic. Thus, it is reasonable to assume, and some persons interviewed acknowledged, that should public day nurseries or other new programs for the very young become available, Catholic children would use them. Despite this, there is no reason to believe that their establishment under non-sectarian auspices will be facilitated by Catholic interests; there is every reason to anticipate opposition.

Those interviewed showed sensitivity to the charge that their position over the years has been a major factor in blocking state aid for day care. They feel that upstate legislators and welfare commissioners alike share the responsibility, together with those groups which would not permit the Catholic agencies to share in financial support.

Since a strong faction of upstate legislative leadership is Catholic also, it is difficult to assess fully the respective weights to be assigned to factors of sectarianism and upstate political preference in explaining legislative action, or, rather, inaction.

Protestant Welfare

The legislative activities of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies have been modest, since it does not maintain staff for this purpose. It has generally supported state aid to day care, but had indicated its preference for Welfare Department auspices, despite the fact that many of its member agencies are strongly represented in the Day Care Council, which has consistently opposed the welfare sponsorship in state aid. It is reported that this position has not arisen so much from philosophical considerations as from the fact that a welfare arrangement seemed to be the best one to improve and expand the existing New York day care program. Until recently the issue of educational auspices was never seriously evaluated, since this did not directly concern the immediate objectives of the member agencies. The new pressures and activity in behalf of pre-school programs, appear to have stimulated an interest on the part of some of the board members to explore the implications and possible impact of these new developments.

Jewish Welfare

Group day care has not been one of the services in which the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies has shown any deep concern. Like the Protestant organization, many of its members are also represented on the Day Care Council and sponsor day care centers. As a central body, however, the Jewish Federation has not demonstrated any specific leadership in this area, but has generally supported the positions of the Day Care Council.

Citizens' Groups

The Day Care Council in the city of New York is the single most influential citizens' organization representing the local day care interests and sees itself as their spokesman. Others in the community, like Citizens' Committee for Children and the Citizens' Union, usually take their cue from or are alerted to needs by the Day Care Council, although their stands are often quite independent. It can be said that the Council's basic position would be widely shared by many of the other sophisticated citizens' organizations concerned with this service.

The Day Care Council has an enlightened and forward looking leadership which, for years, has tried to expand day care facilities and services to meet the perpetual large waiting list. It is the local group with the highest degree of commitment to day care and to whom this is a cause to be promoted *zealously*. This goes back to the Mayor's Committee days. It has spearheaded most of the legislative actions in this field in the state, and gave leadership to the organization of the National Citizens' Committee for Day Care. As a policy making group, it has been most active in promotion of higher standards, personnel practices, and the securing of funds. While it participates in administration of the present program, it has a more flexible approach to unmet needs and proposed solutions and less "trained incapacity" than do many of the public officials. Council leaders are sometimes impatient with what seem to be unnecessary restrictions on eligibility and definitions of service.

It should be added, however, that while Day Care Council members on the one hand want to see expansion of goals and inclusion into the Council of new groups and programs, they are accustomed to working towards change from within the Joint Policy Committee and through the offices of the Welfare Commissioner.

The Council has been most effective in maintaining the non-sectarian character of the program to which it has been strongly and unequivocably committed, even when this position has involved a rift with the Commissioner. In some ways the group feels a sense of frustration in its inability to remove the obstacles to expansion, yet remains steadfast in its opposition to policies which might impair the non-sectarian character of the program. Leaders place hope on the new federal day care funds. They would like to be able to serve more children from families where the mother is at home, and where the incapacity of the mother is the major problem, rather than the mother's working. However, without greatly expanded facilities they feel the present admissions policy could not be changed.

Council members feel that their educational program has been sound. They could make it better if there were more funds available for higher salaries, better personnel practices, and in-service training. Their leaders have been active in vitalizing the State Child Welfare Advisory Committee, are actively developing a new in-service training proposal, and expect to play an important role in future state affairs.

Some important day care leaders would like to see an extension of pre-school programs in the Board of Education, based on a short day. They see this as a different type of program from day care, and one appropriate for schools to undertake. Where a longer day care program for deprived children is planned, imposing such additional concerns as adequate nutrition, care and protection, and recreation, the auspices should possibly be some other new agency. They do not look with favor on new extended day care programs to be operated by the school system as presently constituted, because they fear that the program might fail to provide the broad array of services and care which disadvantaged young children need. Most recently in response to newer proposals and pressures, they have expressed resentment at the fact that day care is surrounded with a class stigma and confined to economically and socially disadvantaged young groups. They now state that they would like to see public services available to all mothers who must work, or who for other reasons need such services and cannot afford them.

The transition now under way and the forces generating it could be observed when a HARYOU spokesman addressed a meeting called by the Day Care Council recently. When policies for the proposed central Harlem pre-school academies were discussed, including the projected elimination of any social or economic means tests or fees and higher pay for teachers, considerable interest was indicated on the part of those present. Questions were addressed to the impact this could have on the nine public day care centers presently operating in Harlem. For example, would mothers use the public child welfare day centers if free service were available elsewhere in that community? What would be the impact on day care teachers who already receive salaries lower than those paid to Board of Education kindergarten teachers? The idea that an area, like central Harlem, where presently only 500 children are in day care, would be equipped to serve 4,200 children had a startling effect.

However, there is no concrete manifestation that the HARYOU plans and other developments have stimulated any specific proposal by the New York City Day Care Council for change even though this group could be extremely effective and could become an important political force if it should decide to move in new directions.*

The National Committee for Day Care for Children

The National Committee for Day Care for Children cooperates with representatives of over 40 important national organizations and has exerted considerable influence in the legislative arena and with the national agencies, especially Children's Bureau.

---

*Since completion of this report, word has been received of new expansion proposals being developed by the Council.

It has recently stimulated a meeting of all the State Day Care Advisory chairmen, and is establishing a national office of information. It has made proposals going beyond the scope of present legislation to the President's staff which is developing the war on poverty program.

A recent letter to R. Sargent Shriver from Mrs. Guggenheimer suggests the establishment of a "Family Center" in low-income neighborhoods which would house such services as a citizens' advice bureau, home finding services to help families move to better dwellings, an employment service, and family and group day care. It describes the group day care center for children three to five as one with the following objectives:

- removing a child from an unsupervised or unsuitable environment during the day without breaking up the family;
- providing strong educational content in the program to prepare the child for entry into the school system;
- providing health examinations and any services needed to insure physical well-being of children;
- providing psychiatric consultation service for families and children who require it;
- involving the families in the day care center, and in the other services of the center.

The National Committee leadership has reported that it is restudying its views on such day care policies as fees, means tests, counseling and the implications of the new ideas emanating from the urban development, poverty and civil rights movements in relation to its future role.

Child Welfare League

The Child Welfare League of America has substantial power and prestige in the area of standard-setting. It has strong roots in voluntary leadership on a national level and excellent professional staff. It is important in any scheme of potential change. It has traditionally seen day care as a limited child welfare service. In recent editorials and articles in its publication, however, there seems to be a general mood of reexamination of day care issues, and projection of a broader concept more akin to a social utility than a therapeutic resource limited to a few. However, its position on current issues will not be stated until its ongoing study is completed.

In a preliminary report of Phase I of this study, a recent analysis of community opinions, secured in 1961, of lay leaders, businessmen, clergymen, boards of councils, as well as local social workers in seven counties, disclosed that attitudes throughout the country still reflected the old biases.*

Day care is not an area of service generally considered salient or important by community leaders.

Even social workers indicated only moderate familiarity with day care facilities. Thus, there is no great need. In community planning, day care has been assigned only moderate priority. Relevance of day care is accepted primarily for curbing juvenile delinquency and for its therapeutic value for emotionally disturbed children. Its preventive aspects are not broadly recognized.

---

* In a recent discussion with research staff we were assured that a similar sampling taken today would disclose the same findings.

Suitability of group day care for very young children remains a focus for controversy.

There is considerable scientific history behind this topic stemming principally from the findings of John Bowlby and Anna Freud, and other studies showing the effect of total separation of the child from his home and the effects of care in institutional settings. Community leaders and others studied appeared unaware of the newer research about separation of young children from parents, or of ideas developing in education.

There is a lack of consensus regarding society's responsibility to provide day care services, except in cases of extreme destitution and to prevent family breakdown.

Attitudes as to whether such responsibility should be that of voluntary or government agencies varied, and the largest dissension was in regard to federal support, except as limited to special or hardship cases. Opposition to government intervention was part of a general fear of government control.

Those who feel that female employment is undesirable hesitate to make day care facilities more accessible for fear of encouraging or promoting this trend.

If one feels a woman is wrong in going to work, when she has a husband to support her and young children, one may feel she should bear the cost of this decision.

Thus, the study found that in many communities, day care is seen as a service for the underprivileged family and the AFDC child; the trend toward more women in the labor force is resisted ideologically if not in fact; fear that day care will encourage this trend still exists; certain religious groups believe that extended day care will weaken the role of the family; and many professional workers hold that children under six are better off with their mothers, when possible, and do not therefore support alternatives.

American Public Health Association

The American Public Health Association, composed mainly of public health officials, through its new Committee on Maternal and Child Health is studying the possibility of a new role for itself. This has been prompted by the emphasis in the federal day care legislation on utilizing advice from health authorities. This committee desires to participate more in day care standard-setting. It is presently reevaluating the conflicting professional viewpoints in the care of the infant and toddler, child development and early mental health interventions. It will work in close liaison with the National Association for Nursery Education.

Public Education Association

New York's Public Education Association sees day care as an educational function which belongs as part of the total educational package. However, its interests have not until very recently been centered on the young child.

Civil Rights

Much of the heat under the cauldron of ferment has been supplied by the civil rights organizations. Their leadership has strongly supported the proposals of Commissioner Allen's committee calling for pre-school educational programs and a realignment of the school system. Those interviewed stressed two basic points:

- the need for appropriate location and concentration of such day care facilities as will become available to serve the interests of integration and the need for quality education at an earlier age;
- their deep concern over the need for more facilities for the children of working mothers.

SUMMARY

Any basic changes in the character of the New York City day care program, or a new format which would include both expansion and extension, which would seem to move it from a child welfare base, will be opposed by those forces dedicated to maintaining such requirements as the economic and social needs test, care and protection aspects, and limitations to a small portion of those requiring the service. On the side of such limitations are most federal, state and local public child welfare and day care officials, some sectarian groups, many workers in public assistance and voluntary social agencies, as well as unestimated segments in the public at large, who would like to exploit the unavailability of public day care to stem the tide employment of mothers of young children.

On the other hand, the pressure of the civil rights movement, the concern with the disadvantaged generated by the war on poverty, and the new ideas about compensatory socialization and educational experiences for the very young have made their impact. Educators talk increasingly of pre-school education; and various special reports, deriving from the effort to advance public school integration, have proposed pre-school programs.

Many child welfare officials and public welfare authorities, while defending the validity of child welfare concepts for day care programs also accept the probable need for new efforts more in the mainstream of education, perhaps supplemented by social work and health services and organized apart from day care.

New city and national factors seem likely to be strong enough to generate new programs, if financial problems can be solved -- and will be less likely to be stopped, if what they offer is not a direct change in day care but a parallel and somewhat different program, with some educational connection.

VIII

THE BEGINNERS' DAY SCHOOL: A PROPOSAL

These explorations suggest that the public day care program in New York City, its most developed locus, renders extremely valuable service and is in need of expansion, but can not meet the needs we have described throughout this report. Day care as presently perceived and as presently functioning here is a child-welfare-oriented service, requiring an economic and social needs test and the payment of fees. It is designed primarily for care and protection, not for the education of the disadvantaged child, although education is included. It serves only a small portion of the need, and its rapid expansion is beset by interest group conflicts, lack of funds, lack of clear perception as to its appropriate function in a changing environment, and a lack of flexibility in its public-private structure.

Many of the day care program professionals cling to the theory that most children are not ready for structured learning stimuli before the age of six, and they question the more recent studies pointing to the values of compensatory education of the disadvantaged child from the age of three.

On the other hand, the philosophy, staffing patterns, alignments and aspirations of the day care system all point to its strengthening in precisely the direction it has followed traditionally. If there were a primary, educationally focused resource for three and four year olds, there would continue to be need for an essentially therapeutically-oriented group child care resource, *accessible to child welfare, public assistance, family guidance and clinical personnel* who uncover the need in the course of work. The resource would be chosen as appropriate for solving a family or a parent-child problem and would be supported by casework or group therapeutic programs. Individual diagnostic decisions would guide admissions, program specification and discharge.

In other words, the logic of child welfare day care as a social service for families who are diagnostically selected is sound and in need of support and expansion. Its more complete implementation depends on progress in upgrading social service and educational staffs and eliminating those children who require another less specialized and less expensive type of resource.

The 1962 public welfare amendments, apart from the direct day care fund authorizations, offer some possibility to states for expansion of this kind of day care. Where family rehabilitative or preventive objectives require a day care resource, federal reimbursement to the extent of 75 percent may be available in the context of a total plan. All possible should be done to expand federal child welfare day care funding.

This much said, it is possible to think about the type of educationally-oriented resource which might be developed for a much larger group of children who do not enter as referral "cases." Educators are beginning to talk of pre-school compensatory programs; and a variety of proposals, many not yet released, are being developed. Some of what is suggested ignores the dimensions of the task.

Thus it has been proposed that the New York City Board of Education set up classes for four-year olds in slum areas, with half-day attendance and double utilization of classrooms and teachers.* This half-day of the program could cover the instructional content of the curriculum, offering as much as young children could use each day. To plan only this, however, ignores the critical needs of most children of low-income working mothers and others for a full child development program for at least eight or nine hours per day, and 52 weeks per year. Half days could be optional in all-day programs, but half-day programs will not do for many families which need service. Another non-instructional half-day needs to be scheduled.

One of the dangers inherent in the creation of a new educationally centered program would be its limitation as an offering directed solely at the child's intellectual development, narrowly conceived. While in theory, educators would not so move, supports from social services and health professions if formally provided would create a program more adequately equipped for a comprehensive child development focus and for family community involvement.

---

* As of December, 1964, half-day classes for about 1,000 four year olds have been added to the regular school program. Two hundred more classes serving about 3,000 children, are planned for next year.

Some parents would resist the new programs and others who would approve of them would not know how to support them either because of their own lack of understanding or daily pressures. Parents must be involved if the child is to reap the maximum benefit, even to the extent of being offered parallel group experiences and opportunities for cultural enrichment or being drawn in as "helpers" who learn while observing and who see their task as optimizing the outcome for the child.

We propose the creation of a "Beginners' Day School," as part of an evolving overall neighborhood type of program in which the disciplines of health, education and welfare are synthesized rather than merely coordinated. Ideally this would be an educationally-based program, guided by a coalition of several disciplines.

Such a "Beginners' Day School" should provide:

1. A special educationally-oriented day program for children in the three and four year age group. It would be closely integrated with new programs, offered on an upgraded basis and developed in enriched schools in disadvantaged areas.

It would eventually ideally be connected with a "community school" of the type proposed by Henry Saltzman[87] and being tried in a number of cities.

2. Health facilities and health care to include immunization, preventive care and treatment and some means of caring for the sick child, where necessary.

3. Recreation and play, both indoors and out, as part of the educational program, to enhance socializing experiences.

4. Planned activities for cultural enrichment.

5. Nutritional support, particularly through hot lunches and snacks.

6. Flexibility in the length of day, and year-round service.

7. Social work counseling for both the child and parent, where needed in individual cases, or referred from school personnel.

8. An advice and information center, to help parents make decisions with respect to their children in relation to child-rearing and family problems.

9. Parent group activities, courses, and volunteer activities as an integrated part of the day school, with emphasis on self-help opportunities.

10. Means of safe transportation to and from home.

Before suggesting more specifically how such a program initially might be located administratively in New York City, our case example, some of the implications of our view on a national level may deserve emphasis. In effect, the conclusions have already been drawn in the logic of the findings of previous sections.

First, it is clear that the child welfare direction for day care continues to make sense as a social service support and nothing here proposed should be construed as a case against the current expansion and strengthening of such programs.

However, true diagnostic selection and social service supports should be developed in child welfare day care whereas now they are more often ideology than practice. On the other hand, inability to meet the test of having a working mother, the major test today, should not deprive children growing up in deprived social and familial environments (and ultimately all children whose parents elect the service) of a group educational-socialization-child development experience.

Second, if the beginners' day school is conceived of as a new social utility, a resource available to all, a form of developmental provision (all phases which differentiate it from the "case" service) it should be institutionally based in a social institution so perceived by the population at large. Education is such an institution. While the degree of readiness to undertake this responsibility varies by geographic level (federal, state and local) and by administrative level within education departments all our explorations suggest the logic of the educational base. Nor are the obstacles overwhelming. Indeed, it would appear that the likelihood of the necessary financing is greater here than under the welfare (meaning public assistance and child welfare) banner.

Third, we have talked of a beginners' day school, not of pre-school education, precisely so as to clarify that *what is involved is not merely a matter of lowering the school admission age,* albeit on a voluntary basis. The components of a beginners' day school as listed above are all vital and would create a facility qualitatively quite different from the pre-school programs being launched in New York City in educational terms at the time that this report was being completed. While based in education, the beginners' day school should be created and guided by an education-social welfare coalition, supported by health services. Social welfare personnel have precedents for working in the context of other social institutions and would help shape this new program while continuing in another role in the more traditional day care programs.

We would urge national guidance and support for all of this through the United States Office of Education, but any state is in a position to make beginnings and to experiment. For New York City, four administrative patterns would appear possible:

Model A: Perhaps *the public school system itself* may be prepared to house the effort and to launch it in a few selected spots in the context of its effort to upgrade schools in deprived areas and as part of its racial integration plan.

There is some readiness to make the effort, but there are financial problems which need to be solved.*

The program, if attempted, should be turned over to a new "team" consisting of educators, social work and health personnel in the school system, with the order of listing suggesting relative roles. Kindergarten administrators and primary grade educators seem to be overwhelmed and to have a pre-school concept which is different from that which could be, of its own right, a beginners' school. The school system is staffed with representatives of all the required disciplines, now organized in specialized bureaus.

Model B: Neighborhood opportunity-type programs provide ideal settings since they bring new community coalitions together and offer the possibility of an auspice which is local and includes personnel from education, social work and health without being based in the traditional "department" of any one. The HARYOU plan has been mentioned, and Mobilization for Youth already exists in New York City. There are equivalent programs in many other cities.

Such a plan has other advantages, besides being potentially free of traditional departmental administrative alignments. It allows the beginners' day school to develop in the context of an overall self-help effort which includes many new programs and resources for parents and provision for use of indigenous personnel. Financing is possible through the President's Committee on Delinquency and Youth Crime, the National Institute of Health, the United States Office of Education, the federal and local poverty programs and local government resources and private foundations, all of which are participating or will participate in future comprehensive community endeavors.

---

*Since this was written the schools have launched pre-school programs which, in our view, are too narrowly conceived in educational terms and -- by not planning for a full day -- are available to a limited group.

Such a model also has limitations. It covers only a small portion of the city and does not solve the problem of an administrative "home" for the program as it expands. The only possible answer, then, is that this model is an interim device but realistic, since one could not cover a city all at once and since experience may settle where the "home department" should be. In the interim, temporary agreements would have to be reached, allowing inspection and standard-setting by educational, health and welfare authorities so as to protect children -- yet so doing it as to avoid forcing the endeavor into traditional channels.

The fact that several new community mobilizations are being planned in New York may offer serious possibilities for this model.

Model C.: Welfare authorities or day care personnel, particularly lay sponsoring boards in a few areas, could undertake a worthwhile experiment either by moving some day care centers in this direction or by creating something new under welfare auspices -- with a stress on long term prevention. Financing under demonstration funds available to the Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration, is theoretically possible. Our analysis suggests that these groups are more likely to develop child welfare day care than a beginners' day school, but should they decide to bring their child development and social service capability to bear upon strengthening the educational component, the experiment would be deserving of strong support. The authors of this report would welcome efforts along these lines even though we have noted the ideological "baggage" which seems to limit the possibilities nationally. There are few groups with richer relevant experience. Such an approach would require a new administrative instrumentality within the local welfare department if it involved a program different from, but paralleling, day care. (The Welfare Commissioner does not consider this wholly impossible.)

Model D: On a demonstration basis and in the short run, settlement houses and other local agencies might experiment with program and format. What would be involved, technically, would be qualifying as a day care facility and going beyond it. Such efforts face enormous problems of recruitment of personnel, clarification to the community as to what is offered, development of program without central support. Only an unusually qualified agency with good "grant" financing from federal or foundation sources should attempt this, and only on a pilot basis. A large-scale program is needed, and for the reasons given, it should be public and available on request as a right.

Each of the models has validity for some places. New York City could probably best move in relation to "A" and "B", if some federal financing becomes available under the anti-poverty plans or through other sources. Problems will arise because so much is yet unknown about response, program, and the shaping of a new professional team. Such problems can best be solved by building in the necessary evaluative procedures in the early efforts. There are several possible approaches and more than one should be tried -- and soon, for the need is urgent and every delay means more youngsters who may never fully overcome serious initial handicaps.

It will take many new policies and a variety of new forms of social provision if our urban societies are to cope effectively with the challenges of the human rights revolution and are to implement the announced determination to break the costly cycles of poverty, deprivation, anti-social maladjustments and social waste. Among the needed developments there should clearly be some new forms of provision for the very young.

Eventually, whatever emerges should be available to all in the same sense that we increasingly offer public kindergartens which may be used if parents elect to do so.

The social problems currently faced in the inner city demand that whatever new resources are committed for service to the very young be concentrated initially in the most deprived areas. The more prosperous will continue to purchase nursery school care, and those in the middle-income categories, who cannot afford private care and who do not reside in the most deprived areas, will for a period suffer a service gap. Such a policy can be justified initially only in the knowledge that these families are better equipped culturally and educationally to stimulate the development of their children in the normal course of child rearing and family life -- so that they are prepared to make use of kindergarten and the early grades.

What is needed, basically, in the most deprived areas of the city is a social instrument to offer compensatory educational and child development experiences for the very young. The goal is that they may subsequently enter their primary grade education on a level closer to those whose own homes do offer the stimuli, guidance and help necessary to prepare a child with the habits, the values and the experiences which will enable him to comprehend, to understand relationships and to learn. A good beginning for a child may mean a better education. Only young people with skills, knowledge and motivation will survive successfully in an increasingly automated and skill-demanding labor market. Only employable young people can form stable families, become good community participants and break out of the cycle of apathy, dependency, and anti-social solutions which poverty and discrimination breed.

FOOTNOTES

1. Facts showing the extent, characteristics, social consequences and transmission of poverty from generation to generation are fully documented by Mollie Orshansky, "The Children of the Poor," *Social Security Bulletin,* July 1963, Vol. 26, no. 1.

2. Ravitz, Mel, "The Role of the School in the Urban Setting" *Education in Depressed Areas,* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963, p.6.

3. Based on figures contained in *Welfare in Review*, April 1964, Vo. 2. no. 4, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, pp. 29-39.

4. Morgan, James N., et al, *Income and Welfare in the United States*, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1962, p. 217.

5. Children's Bureau Release, May 6, 1959, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

6. For original source see New York City Health Department study, Research Plan: "Magnitude and Scope of Family Day Care Problems in New York City," p. 1.

7. In 1962, Title IV of the Social Security Act (Grants to States for Aid to Dependent Children) was amended to provide, among other things, services to help families to become self-supporting. Increased federal financing to reduce dependency and encourage self-support with particular emphasis on the ADC family, was made available to the states.

8. A new day care provision was passed and new funds for day care appropriated as part of the 1962 public welfare amendments, to be administered by the Children's Bureau.

9. Children's Bureau release, 1959, *op. cit.*

10. New York City Health Department study, *op. cit.*

11. *Working Mothers and Day Care Services in the United States*, Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962.

12. *Facts About Children,* Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962.

13. Information furnished by the Division of Day Care, Day Camps, and Institutions, New York City Department of Health.

14. *Dimensions of Poverty in New York City* - released to the press on March 23, 1964.

15. *Youth in the Ghetto, A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness*, New York: Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., 1964, table 7. p. 117.

16. "A Research and Action Project on the Field of Day Care for Children," Child Welfare League of America, September 1960. The Child Welfare League of America is a national privately-supported membership organization of child welfare agencies. It is devoted to the development of standards and improvement of services to deprived, dependent and neglected children.

17. Hoffman, Gertrude, "New Dimensions For Day Care Services," a mimeographed paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, 1963, p. 5.

18. "Day Care Services, Form and Substance," a report of a national conference on day care held Nov. 17-18, 1960, Children's Bureau publication, no. 393, 1961.

19. Child Welfare League of America, *Standards for Day Care Service,* 1960. p. 2

20. For original source of quotation and material in this and following paragraph see Bernice H. Fleiss, *The Relationship of the Mayor's Committee on Wartime Care of Children to Day Care in New York City*, 1962. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), New York University, p. 4 .

21. *Ibid.*, p. 3

22. Kroeber, A. L., *Anthropology,* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1948, p. 288.

23. Hunt, J. McV., Intelligence and Experience, New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1961, p. 2.

24. *Youth in the Ghetto,* op. cit., p. 188.

25. *Ibid.* pp. 189-194.

26. Deutsch, Martin P., "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process" in *Education in Depressed Areas,* edited by A. Harry Passow, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963, pp 165-167, 170-173.

27. Ravitz, Mel., *op. cit.*, p. 19

28. Deutsch, Martin P., Facilitating Development in the Pre-School Child: Social and Psychological Perspectives, mimeographed revision of a paper originally prepared for the Arden House Conference on Pre-School Enrichment of Socially Disadvantaged Children, Harriman, New York, December 1962, In Press: Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, Spring 1964, pp 14-15 passim.

29. Committee of Correspondence, Bulletin no. 87, September 1963, p. 1.

30. Material and facts as well as original sources of content in Chapter III are contained in Bernice Fleiss, op. cit. passim. Only specific citations are footnoted.

31. *Ibid.* p. 10

32. *Ibid*. p. 14

33. *Ibid.* p. 15

34. For original source see Dorothy Zeitz, *Child Welfare*, New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959, p. 173

35. *Ibid.*, p. 187

36. Material in above three paragraphs is taken from mimeographed brief on California Child Care Centers furnished in correspondence with Theresa S. Mahler, Director, Child Care Centers Division of the San Francisco Unified School District dated March 19, 1964.

37. *Ibid.*

38. Fleiss., *op. cit.*, p. 39

39. *Ibid.*, p. 39

40. *Ibid*., p. 46

41. Ibid., p. 66

42. "An Evaluation of the State-Aided Child Day Care Program," submitted by L.S. Horan, Staff Member, New York State Youth Commission, 1947.

43. Study of Public-Private Day Care Centers in New York, Community Service Society, New York. This study is not completed or ready for release.

44. See Appendix A - Members of Joint Policy Committee of New York City Day Care Council and Department of Welfare.

45. Material in the following five paragraphs based on minutes of the Day Care Council, passim, and interviews with its leaders.

46. Joint Policy Committee Minutes, June 1954, on file at Day Care Council office.

47. Facts About Children, Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

48. "Cost Analysis in a Day Care Center," a study financed by a Children's Bureau grant to Brandeis University in the fall of 1963.

49. Information furnished in interview with Miss Elizabeth Vernon, Chief, Division of Day Care, Day Camps and Institutions, New York City Department of Health.

50. Above material taken from Job Description of Educational Consultant prepared by the Division of Day Care, 1953, reported to be currently in use.

51. All beginning Bureau of Child Welfare investigators must meet civil service requirements which are: college graduation and a Bachelor's Degree. They start as social investigator trainees and remain so for one year, after which the trainee title is dropped. Division of Day Care uses the preferred term "counselor."

52. Qualifications for Day Care Center Staff (Day Care Bulletin no. 7A Personnel Practices, effective September 1, 1961).

53. Material in above paragraph furnished by Miss Elizabeth Vernon, Chief, Division of Day Care, Day Camps, and Institutions, New York City Department of Health.

54. Reported in interviews with leaders formerly associated with the Mayor's Committee.

55. Eligibility and Intake Policies for Day Care Centers (Day Care Bulletin no. 27, Feb. 14, 1952)

56. Form M-904b (Revised 7/1/60), Weekly Budget Record in Procedure for Determining Financial Eligibility and Fees For Day Care Service (Day Care Procedure no.3, revised June 1, 1962).

57. For all statistics used in this chapter relating to family and child characteristics see Appendix B. - Family Status Statistics - 20% Sampling prepared by Division of Day Care (1962-1963).

58. Form M-904e (Revised 4/2/62) Table of Day Care Center Fees in Day Care Procedure no. 3, revised, op.cit.

59. Family Status Statistics, op.cit.

60. These earlier figures contained in Report of Tenth Annual Day Care Week, 1957, in files of Day Care Council.

61. The following material is taken from "Joel Earnest" papers of the Civic Legislative League,on file with special collection section of Columbia University.

62. Earnest reported this in a memorandum to his membership, October 31, 1950.

63. Letter from Utica Community Chest and Planning Council to Earnest, 1/4/52.

64. The following two paragraphs based on Joint Policy Committee minutes 10/24/55 and 11/7/55 and 12/5/55.

65. Letter dated February 3, 1955 from Irving M. Kriegsfeld, Executive Director of the Baden Street Settlement, Inc.

66. Material in above five paragraphs from interviews with day care leaders, and the legislative files of both Day Care Council and Citizens' Committee for Children, passim.

67. Memorandum filed with Assembly Bill no. 5320, April 3, 1964, bearing Governor Rockefeller's veto.

68. Copy of memorandum in favor of A.I. 5320 sent to Governor Rockefeller by the State Department of Social Welfare.

69. This paragraph and the following five are based on statement called "The Problem of Sectarianism," in the child care files of the Citizens' Committee for Children.

70. Reported in interviews.

71. Minutes of Child Care Section of Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, March 19, 1963.

72. Goldsmith, Cornelia, "A Law Suit Won - In Favor of Young Children," *The Journal of Nursery Education,* vol. 19, no.2 January 1964, pp. 96-97

73. For fuller discussion of day care provisions, see *Guides to State Welfare Agencies For the Development of Day Care Services*, Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June, 1963.

74. Section 527 and 102b of the Social Security Act, as amended in 1962.

75. *Guides to State Welfare Agencies*, *op.cit.*, p. 14.

76. *Ibid.*, p. 2

77. The following section is based on material contained in "State Action on the Child Welfare Provisions of the 1962 Amendments," *Welfare in Review,* Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, vol. 2, no. 1, January, 1964, p. 15.

78. See Appendix C - State Advisory Committee for Day Care.

79. Deutsch, Martin P., *Facilitating Development in the Pre-School Child,* op.cit., p. 23.

80. For full titles, sources, and more complete discussion of ideas contained in following three paragraphs, see Deutsch, *Ibid.*, passim.

81. See Appendix D - List of Individuals interviewed, Affiliations, and Positions Held.

82. See Appendix E - Interest Groups Represented in Interviews.

83. Dumpson, James R., "The Place of Day Care In Meeting Children's Needs," *Child Welfare,* vol. XLIII, no. 4, April, 1964. pp. 182-183

84. Statement of Mr. Charles J. Tobin, Jr., Secretary, New York State Catholic Welfare Conference, submitted for record of Hearings on Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, Bill No. 10032, before the Committee on Ways and Means, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, p. 583.

85. Gallagher, Rt. Rev., Msgr. Raymond J., secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities in testimony of Hearings on Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, Ibid., pp. 578-580.

86. See Appendix F - Cooperating Organizations, National Committee For the Day Care of Children, Inc.

87. Saltzman, Henry, "The Community School in the Urban Setting," Education in Depressed Areas, op.cit., p.327

APPENDIX A

MEMBERS OF JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE OF NEW YORK CITY DAY CARE COUNCIL AND DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE

Representatives of Day Care Council - Board Members

Mrs. George Stewart, Chairman of Joint Policy Committee, President of Day Care Council

Mrs. Charles Benenson, Member of board of Sunshine Nursery Schools in the Bronx

Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer, President of National Committee for Day Care of Children, Chairman of Day Care Council

Edward L. Kilroe, Vice President of Day Care Council, Board member of Bethany Lenox Hill Day Care Center

Mrs. Alfred F. Loomis, Board member of Union Settlement

Maxwell Powers, Executive Director of Greenwich House

Mrs. J. Folwell Scull, Jr., Board member of Brooklyn Kindergarten Society

Stephen Slobadin, Executive Director of Christodora House

Representatives of Department of Welfare

Miss Katherine O'Connell, Director, Division of Day Care

Miss Florence Kennedy, Chief Educational Consultant

Miss Sadie Silver, Senior Administrative Assistant in charge of Finances of Day Care Division

Miss Muriel Katz, Senior Casework Supervisor, Division of Day Care

Miss Elizabeth Beine, Director of Bureau of Child Welfare

Mr. Joseph Louchheim, First Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Welfare

APPENDIX B

FAMILY STATUS STATISTICS - 20% SAMPLING

DIVISION OF DAY CARE

SECTION I

THE PROGRAM INCLUDED:	June 1 1962	June 1 1963
No. of Units	118	121
No. of Centers - Total	82	84
Nursery	81	83
School Age	37	38
Combined N. and S.A.	36	37
NO. OF CHILDREN SERVED	6,515	6,857
Pre-school	5,246	5,518
School Age	1,269	1,339
NO. OF FAMILIES SERVED	4,749	5,005
REFERRAL FROM OTHER AGENCIES	100%	100%
Welfare Center	3.4	2.3
Bureau of Child Welfare	1.1	1.2
Family Agency	1.6	2.7
Hospital	4.3	5.1
Agency for Handicapped Children	.2	.0
Other	2.2	3.4
No Referral	87.2	85.3
SOCIAL SERVICE EXCHANGE REPORTS RECORD OF	58.3	62.4
Active Public Assistance	4.9	8.3
Closed Public Assistance	35.3	36.1
Active Foster Care	.3	.7
Closed Foster Care	8.4	7.7
Social Service Exchange Report no record	41.7	37.6
ETHNIC GROUP		
Father	100%	100%
P.R.	17.6	17.9
White	32.6	29.6
Negro	47.9	50.0
Other	1.2	1.6
Unknown	.7	.9
Mother	100%	100%
P.R.	17.3	17.4
White	33.9	30.4
Negro	47.2	50.5
Other	1.6	1.7
Unknown	.0	.0
Of Some Ethnic Group	93.8	94.1
Of Different Ethnic Group	4.4	3.7
Unknown	1.8	2.2

APPENDIX B (Continued)

SECTION II

RELIGION:	June 1 1962	June 1 1963
Father	100%	100%
Catholic	43.5	40.6
Jewish	8.8	7.3
Protestant	43.5	47.1
Other	4.2	4.4
Unknown		.6
Mother	100%	100%
Catholic	43.7	42.5
Jewish	9.8	7.9
Protestant	43.3	46.6
Other	3.2	2.8
Unknown		.2
Of Same Religion	84.4	83.9
Of Different Religion	15.6	16.1
NO. OF ADULTS IN FAMILY GROUP - 100%	(1,696)	(1,774)
Father	33.2	32.7
Mother	60.1	60.9
Other	6.7	6.4
NO. OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY GROUP	(2,749)	(2,927)
NO. OF CHILDREN IN DAY CARE	100%	100%
Pre-school	76.1	76.6
School Age	23.9	23.4
HOME	100%	100%
No. of Rooms - 1	3.1	2.1
2	4.3	5.3
3	16.9	15,9
4	42.8	43.5
5	26.3	25.8
6	4.8	5.6
7	1.3	1.3
8 and over	.5	.5
No. of Occupants	100%	100%
No. of adults	40.0	39.1
No. of Children	60.0	60.9
TYPE OF HOUSING	100%	100%
Public Housing	45.4	44.8
Non-Public Housing	54.6	55.2

APPENDIX B (Continued)

SECTION III

	June 1 1962	June 1 1963
MONTHLY RENT	100%	100%
Under $20.00	1.3	1.5
20 - 29	1.3	1.8
30 - 39	6.8	5.8
40 - 49	12.8	12.1
50 - 59	21.3	17.0
60 - 69	23.7	26.1
70 - 79	14.4	14.5
80 - 89	9.3	9.6
90 - 99	4.3	5.8
100 and Over	4.8	5.8
***REASONS FOR SERVICE FOR CHILD**	100%	100%
Emotional Problem of Child	1.2	1.0
Physical Problem of Child	.5	.9
Problems Within the Home	4.8	4.7
Mother Physically or Emotionally Ill	11.1	13.8
Mother's Need to Work	80.0	77.3
Mother Hospitalized	.6	.3
Mother Deceased	.7	.9
Mother Separated or Deserted	.5	.4
Inadequate Housing	.3	.3
Other	.3	.4
SOURCES OF INCOME AND EARNINGS AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS		
Mother Employed	72.2	69.7
Father Employed	49.2	46.4
Both Parents Employed	29.6	28.5
Other: (Such as receiving UIB, PA,etc.)	8.2	12.4
No Income or Earnings	0.0	0.0
***SOCIAL STATUS**	100%	100%
BOTH PARENTS IN THE HOME	52.5	51.2
Both Parents Competent	42.8	40.8
Mother Incapacitated	8.7	9.1
Father Incapacitated	.9	.8
Both Parents Incapacitated	.1	.5
FATHERLESS HOMES	45.8	47.2
Des - Sep - Dec	42.9	43.2
Hospitalized	.9	.5
Other Status - Father	2.0	3.5
MOTHERLESS HOMES	1.7%	1.6%
Des - Sep - Dec	1.1	1.3
Hospitalized	.6	.3
Other Status Mother	.0	.0

APPENDIX B (Continued)

SECTION IV

	June 1 1962	June 1 1963
OCCUPATION OF MOTHER	100%	100%
Office	19.6	18.9
Factory	24.0	20.8
Sales	3.0	1.7
Service	17.2	19.9
Skilled Labor	.9	.7
Unskilled Labor	1.1	.1
Own Business	.4	.8
Professional	2.0	1.8
Civil Service	4.0	4.9
None or Out of Home	27.8	30.4
OCCUPATION OF FATHER	100%	100%
Office	3.8	2.4
Factory	7.8	9.0
Sales	1.4	1.1
Service	14.0	16.0
Skilled Labor	6.3	5.2
Unskilled Labor	6.1	3.3
Own Business	1.4	.9
Professional	1.8	.9
Civil Service	6.7	7.8
None or Out of Home	50.7	53.4
FINANCIAL STATUS	100%	100%
Income equals or exceeds Day Care	23.0	20.9
Income exceeds P.A. but less Day Care	66.6	65.6
Income equals or less than P.A.	10.4	13.5
FEES PAID PER CHILD	100%	100%
No. of Minimum Fees	78.2	79.0
No. Between $2.25 and $5.00 Wk.	13.5	10.3
No. Between $5.00 and $10.00 Wk.	4.6	7.0
No. Over $10 Wk. (incl. $10. Wk.)	3.7	3.7
AVERAGE FEE PER CHILD PER WEEK	$2.13	$2.21

(Fees in study are based on
July 1960 Family Budget.)

SECTION VI

INCOME	June 1 1962	June 1 1963
TOTAL WEEKLY INCOME	100%	100%
Income Less than $30. wk.	2.1	2.8
$ 30. thru $49. wk.	10.5	10.5
$ 50. thru $69. wk.	20.9	21.1
$ 70. thru $79. wk.	11.5	11.1
$ 80. thru $89. wk.	11.7	9.2
$ 90. thru $99. wk.	9.2	8.9
$ 100. thru $109. wk.	9.1	10.2
$ 110. and Over	25.0	26.2
OTHER SOURCES OF INCOME	27.8%	20.3%
Of Fathers Who are Sole Support	17.4	15.8
Of Fathers with Other Income	2.2	2.1
Other Income Only	8.2	2.4
No Income or Earnings	.0	.0
INCOME EXCLUSIVE OF MOTHER'S EARNINGS (FATHER EMPLOYED AND OTHER INCOME)	100%	100%
Income less than $30. wk.	1.6	.9
Income $30. thru $49. wk.	6.8	6.4
$50. thru $69. wk.	36.0	33.4
$70. thru $89. wk.	24.9	32.1
$90. thru. $109. wk.	13.6	19.7
$110. and Over	7.1	7.5
TOTAL WEEKLY INCOME - Includes both Father's and Mother's Income and Other Income	100%	100%
Income less than $30. wk.	.0	.0
$30. thru $49. wk.	.3	.0
$50. thru $69. wk.	1.2	.3
$70. thru $89. wk.	5.4	3.8
$90. thru. $109. wk.	26.9	25.8
Over $110. wk.	66.2	69.1

APPENDIX B (Continued)

SECTION V

	June 1 1962	June 1 1963
INCOME		
INCOME OF MOTHERS WHO ARE SOLE SUPPORT	22.6%	21.3%
Earnings Less than $20. wk.	.0	.0
Earnings $20. thru $29. wk.	2.1	.9
$30. thru $39. wk.	5.1	4.7
$40. thru $49. wk.	15.2	12.3
$50. thru $59. wk.	21.6	19.1
$60. thru $69. wk.	21.2	22.5
$70. thru $79. wk.	19.1	19.6
$80. and Over	15.7	20.9
OF MOTHERS WHO ARE PRINCIPAL SUPPORT BUT HAVE OTHER INCOME	20.0%	19.9%
Income less than $30. a wk.	1.0	.0
$30. thru $49. wk.	5.2	4.6
$50. thru $69. wk.	27.9	28.2
$70. thru $89. wk.	37.5	34.5
$90. thru $109 wk.	20.2	20.9
Income More than $110 a wk.	8.2	11.8
OF FATHERS - MOTHER'S SUPPLEMENTS	27.7%	27.2%
Earnings Less than $30.	1.4	1.9
$30. thru $39. wk.	1.4	1.6
$40. thru $49. wk.	5.5	4.7
$50. thru $59. wk.	9.7	14.3
$60. thru $69. wk.	27.4	19.3
$70. thru $79. wk.	19.0	19.6
$80. thru $89. wk	15.0	12.6
$90. and Over	19.7	26.9
OF FATHERS WHERE THERE IS OTHER INCOME ALSO AND MOTHER SUPPLEMENTS BOTH	1.3%	1.3%
Income Less than $30. wk.	5.0	.0
$39. thru $49. wk.	5.0	7.1
$50. thru $69. wk.	20.0	28.6
$70. thru $89. wk.	35.0	28.6
$90. thru $109.wk.	15.0	28.6
Income more than $110. wk.	20.0	7.1

APPENDIX C

State Advisory Committee on Day Care

Mrs. DeLeslie Allen, Board member, Baden Street Settlement, Rochester

Mrs. Arthur Andrew, Mount Vernon Day Nursery Association

Msgr. Edmond F. Fogarty, Exceutive Director, Catholic Guardian Society, New York City

Dr. Dale Harrow, Director of the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, New York State Department of Health

Lowell Iberg, Deputy Executive Director, State Charities Aid, New York City

Catherine O'Connell, Director, Division of Day Care, New York City Department of Welfare

Rev. John R. Sise, Executive Secretary and Diocesan Director of Catholic Charities, Albany

Mrs. Frederick Smith, Syracuse

Mrs. Davis Sher, Board member, Jewish Child Care Association, New York City

Sister Mary Joan of Arc)
) Masterson Day Nursery, Albany
Sister Mary Redempta)

Miss Rose Steinkrauss, Executive Director, Neighborhood House, Buffalo

Mrs. George Stewart, President, New York Day Care Council

Horace Putnam, Executive Assistant to Commissioner, New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets

Mrs. Irving Grant, Rochester

Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer, President, National Committee For The Day Care of Children

Mrs. Raymond Neimer, Buffalo

Miss Myra Woodruff, Chief, Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education, New York State Department of Education

Mrs. Merle Hubbard, Executive Director, Westchester Children's Association.

APPENDIX D

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED, AFFILIATIONS, AND POSITIONS HELD

Name	Affiliation	Position Held
Dr. Mildred Almy	Teachers College, Columbia University	Professor of Psychology and Education
Miss Edna P. Amidon	U.S. Department of Education	Director, Home Economics Education Branch
Miss Mildred Arnold	Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare	Director, Division of Social Services
Mrs. Edna Baer	Housing and Development Board of New York City	Assistant Director of Neighborhood Conservation
Miss Inez Baker	Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	Chief of Program Development
Miss Winifred Bell	Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration	Chief of Research and Demonstration Grants
Miss Betty J. Bernstein	Citizen's Committee for Children of New York, Inc.	Associate Director
E.J. Bofferding	Cresap,McCormick and Paget, Management Consultants	Partner
Earl W. Brydges, Rep.	Senate of the State of New York	Chairman of State Education Committee
Charles Brind	New York State Board of Education	Counsel
Dr.Genevieve Carter	Welfare Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	Assistant Director, Division of Research
Mrs.Catherine Chilman	U.S. Children's Bureau Welfare Administration	Assistant Director,

APPENDIX D (Continued)

Name	Affiliation	Position Held
Mrs.Catherine Chilman	U.S.Children's Bureau Welfare Administration	Parent Education Specialist,Child Life Studies Branch, Division of Research
Miss Reba Choate	Bureau of Family Assistance,U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare	Chief,Family and Child Services Group Division of Welfare Services
Mrs. Clara Cohen	New York City	Citizen
Miss Clara Coble	Bank Street College of Education	Field Consultant for Children's Programs
Dr. Martin Deutsch	Institute for Developmental Studies, New York Medical College	Director
Frank Donnelly	Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, Inc.	Child Care Section
James R. Dumpson	Department of Welfare of New York City	Welfare Commissioner
Otis Finley	National Urban League	Educational Director
Mrs. Bernice Fleiss	New York City Board of Education	Staff of Early Childhood Education Department
Msgr.Edmond F. Fogarty	Catholic Guardian Society, New York City	Director
Dr. Charles Gershenson	U.S. Children's Bureau Welfare Administration	Associate Chief, Research Division
Miss Minerva Golden	Division of Day Care, Day Camps and Institutions, New York City Health Department	Head of Day Care Unit
Mrs. Cornelia Goldsmith	The Journal of Nursery Education	Editor

APPENDIX D (Continued)

Name	Affiliation	Position Held
Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer	National Committee for the Day Care of Children	President
Mrs. Eric Haight	Citizens' Committee for Children of New York	Chairman, Child Care Committee
George Hallett	Citizens Union	Executive Secretary
Miss Helen Harris	United Neighborhood Houses	Executive Director
Mrs. Elizabeth Herzog	U.S. Children's Bureau Welfare Administration	Chief, Child Life Studies Branch
Miss Gertrude Hoffman	U.S. Children's Bureau Welfare Administration	Day Care Specialist
Miss Amy Hostler	Mills College for Elementary Education	President
Miss Marianne Jessen	National Committee for the Day Care of Children	Executive Director
Miss Jeweldean Jones	National Urban League	Welfare Director
Miss Florence Kennedy	Day Care Division, New York City Department of Welfare	Chief Educational Consultant
Dr. Joseph O. Loretan	New York City Board of Education	Deputy Superintendent of Curriculum Research and Evaluation
Dr. Helen Mackintosh	U.S. Office of Education	Bureau of Elementary Education
Kenneth Marshall	Harlem Youth Opportunity Unlimited, Inc.	Program Director
Miss Carmela Mercurio	New York City Board of Education	Coordinator of Higher Education

APPENDIX D (Continued)

Name	Affiliation	Position Held
Fred H. Steininger	Welfare Administration U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	Director, Bureau of Family Service
Mrs. George Stewart	New York City Day Care Council	President
Mrs. Sally Sullivan	Citizens Committee for Children of New York	Education Section
Clarence Tompkins	Public Education Association	Research Director
Miss Elizabeth A. Vernon	New York City Department of Health	Chief, Division of Day Care, Day Camps, and Institutions
Miss Eleanor Walsh	State Department of Social Welfare	Assistant to the Deputy, Division of Family Services
Mrs. Rebecca Winton	New York City Board of Education	Chief, Bureau of Early Childhood Education
Miss Myra Woodruff	New York State Department of Education	Chief, Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education
Dr. Lorne H. Woollatt	The University of the State of New York	Associate Commissioner for Research
George K. Wyman	State of New York	Commissioner of Welfare

APPENDIX D (Continued)

Name	Affiliation	Position Held
Miss Elizabeth Mildram	New York State Department of Education	Staff of Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education
Kalman Mintz	State Bureau of Family Welfare, New York State Department of Social Welfare	Associate Welfare Consultant
MacNeil Mitchell, Rep.	Senate of the State of New York	Member,Committee on Affairs of the City of New York
Miss Catherine O'Connell	Division of Day Care Department of Welfare of New York City	Director
Winford Oliphant	New York State Department of Social Welfare	Director, Bureau of Child Welfare
Thomas J. Prather	Bureau of Family Services Welfare Administration	Division of Welfare Services
Miss Florence Ruderman	Child Welfare League of America	Research Director of Day Care Project
Genevieve Ryan	Catholic Charities in the Archdiocese of New York	Consultant in Child Welfare
Miss Milo Schwartzbach	Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	Regional Child Welfare Representative.
Peter Schweitzer	Housing Authority, New York City	Administrative Authority
Miss June Shagaloff	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People	Educational Director
Rosemary Sheridan	Catholic Charities in the Archdiocese of New York	Consultant in Child Welfare
Robert Shulman	State Department of Social Welfare	Deputy Commissioner of State Institutions and Agencies

APPENDIX E

INTEREST GROUPS REPRESENTED IN INTERVIEWS

Local Welfare Officials

State and Federal Welfare Officials

Local Education Officials

State and Federal Education Officials

Voluntary Educational Organizations

Sectarian Welfare Groups

Citizens' Groups (generally involving both professional and lay leaders)

- The Day Care Council of New York City
- Citizens' Committee for Children of New York
- Public Education Association of New York
- Child Welfare League of America
- American Public Health Association
- National Association of Nursery Education
- National Committee for the Day Care of Children

Civil Rights Groups

- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
- The Urban League

APPENDIX F

COOPERATING ORGANIZATIONS
NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE DAY CARE OF CHILDREN, INC.

American Academy of Pediatrics

American Association of University Women

American Foundation for the Blind

American Hearing Society

American Heart Association

American Home Economics Association

American Medical Association

American Nurses' Association, Inc.

American Parents Committee, Inc.

American Public Health Association

American Public Welfare Association

Association for Children Education, International

Association of Junior Leagues of America, Inc.

Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

Community Service Activities - AFL-CIO

Family Service Association of America

General Federation of Women's Clubs

League of Women Voters of U.S.

National Association for Mental Health

National Association for Nursery Education

National Association for Retarded Children

National Child Labor Committee

National Congress - Parents and Teachers

National Council of Catholic Women

APPENDIX F (Continued)

National Council of Churches of Christ - U.S.

National Council of Jewish Women, Inc.

National Council of Negro Women, Inc.

National Council on Crime & Delinquency

National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

National Federation of Settlements

National Foundation

National Publicity Council for Health & Welfare Services

National Recreation Association

National Society for Crippled Children & Adults

National Urban League, Inc.

Play Schools Association, Inc.

Public Housing Administration

Salvation Army

Southern Association for Children Under Six

United Cerebral Palsy, Inc.

United Community Funds & Councils of America

Volunteers of America, Inc.

Young Men's Christian Association of the U.S. A.